arXiv:1402.4414v1 [math.CT] 18 Feb 2014

Smooth coalgebra: testing vector analysis

Bertfried Fauser
Royal Holloway University of London
Bertfried.Fauser@rhul.ac.uk

Dusko Pavlovic
University of Hawaii and Royal Holloway University of London
Dusko.Pavlovic@rhul.ac.uk

Abstract

Processes are often viewed as coalgebras, with the structure maps specifying the state transitions. In the simplest case, the state spaces are discrete, and the structure map simply takes each state to the next states. But the coalgebraic view is also quite effective for studying processes over structured state spaces, e.g. measurable, or continuous. In the present paper we consider coalgebras over manifolds. This means that the captured processes evolve over state spaces that are not just continuous, but also locally homeomorphic to Banach spaces, and thus carry a differential structure. Both dynamical systems and differential forms arise as coalgebras over such state spaces, for two different endofunctors over manifolds. A duality induced by these two endofunctors provides a formal underpinning for the informal geometric intuitions linking differential forms and dynamical systems in the various practical applications, e.g. in physics. This joint functorial reconstruction of tangent bundles and cotangent bundles uncovers the universal properties and a high level view of these fundamental structures, which are implemented rather intricately in their standard form. The succinct coalgebraic presentation provides unexpected insights even about the situations as familiar as Newton's laws.

1 Introduction

Idea: *'Gedankenexperiments'* with algebras and coalgebas

The coalgebraic view of processes is based on capturing the state transitions by the coalgebra structure maps. Since the coalgebra homomorphisms then preserve and reflect the state transitions, they capture the observable behaviors, and the elements of the final coalgebras correspond to the equivalence classes of indistinguishable behaviors. The main utility of the coalgebraic theory of processes has been drawn from this correspondence [55].

However, what is observable, and which behaviors can be distinguished, is not always determined just by the transition systems, i.e. by the coalgebraic specifications alone, like it is in the special case of concurrent processes modulo strong bisimulation [2, 44]. Both in system design and in theoretical analyses, behaviors are usually specified in various *testing* frameworks, along the lines of E.F. Moore's seminal *'Gedankenexperiments'* paper [40]. E.g., in the theory of computation, a process can be specified as a Turing machine, or as a finite state automaton, and such specifications can be naturally presented as coalgebras. But to specify how this process processes data, i.e. how does a state machine compute, and what does it mean that it accepts a language, we must also say how it interacts with the words representing data. And the words are elements of algebras. The interactions between machines and words are Moore's testing correlations. A categorical version of testing correlations, where machines are presented as coalgebras, and tests as the elements of algebras, was studied in [43]. Here we lift the same framework to dynamical systems presented as coalgebras, and paths as the elements of algebras.

Background: Semantic connections of algebras and coalgebras

It is essential to note that, in the testing approach to specifying behaviors, both coalgebras and algebras are parameters of the description, and neither side determines the other. E.g., the whole linear time/branching time spectrum of essentially different computational behaviors [41, 42] can be described by fixing the family of coalgebras, and varying the test algebras. On the other hand, the Chomsky hierarchy of languages, as well as the hierarchy of complexity classes, can be described by fixing the family of tests, and varying the state machines, *viz* the corresponding coalgebras. Both approaches were aligned in [43][1], generalizing the earlier application in [52]. Such *loose* semantical connections of algebras and coalgebras, as two independent dimensions of semantical descriptions, distinguish the testing frameworks used in the present paper, and previously applied in [52, 50, 51, 43, 48, 49], from the *tight* semantical connections of algebras and coalgebras, as arising on the two sides of a duality, and used in algebraic semantics of coalgebraic logic [26, 27, 28]. The idea of testing is echoed more closely in the testing approach to the equivalence of concurrent processes [13, 7], and the two dimensional approach is implemented in terms of algebras and coalgebras in the categorical approach to Structured Operational Semantics, which was developed as an extension of Denotational Semantics of monads [58, 22, 23]. However, while algebras and coalgebras do not completely constrain each other, and varying the algebras allows capturing the linear time/branching time spectrum, they are specified within the same category, and their semantical connection is hardwired as the distributivity requirement, which does not seem to allow, e.g., capturing the language hierarchies. The language acceptance relation and the trace equivalences can be

[1]The latter approach probably deserves a more detailed explanation, especially since its details had to be moved to the Appendix, and the Appendix got removed from the published version of the paper. The full submitted version remained available online.

captured by combining coalgebras and monads in a different way [19]. But then the various tests needed to span linear time – branching time spectrum would have to be folded into monads, which seems like a needless complication. Last but not least, the general paradigm of testing, explicated by E.F. Moore, has been widely used before and independently of his work, not only in concurrency theory [7], but also, e.g., in functional analysis, as the foundation of theory of distributions [56]. In fact, the idea to apply testing in the context of manifolds, that we propose in the present paper, could have just as easily emerged from the theory of distributions as from the theory of coalgebras. A clearly coalgebraic view of differential geometry can be traced back to the 1970s work of Modungo and Stefani on the second tangent bundle and its mixed versions [38]. The naturality of the bundle structures was explicated in [25]. A coalgebraic view of tangent bundles was proposed in [17], leading to the idea that dynamical systems could be viewed modulo the bisimulations relations. This however may suffer from too strong assumptions about a comonad structure on the tangent functor, see comments below.

A different categorical approach to tangent bundles, framed in the context of Synthetic Differential Geometry (SDG) [24], goes back to Lawvere [29] and Rosický [54]. The idea of SDG is to derive the important constructions of differential geometry from abstract categorical axioms. The analytic framework in which differential geometry is usually done is just one of the models of SDG. In order to open an alley towards differential geometry in nonstandard categorical model categories, SDG attempts to extract and axiomatize what is essential for differential geometry, and to abstract away the inessential implementation details. This is, of course, a clean and exciting approach, but it involves researchers' design decisions what is essential in their theory, and what not. Many scientific discoveries, however, happen to emerge from the parts of scientific theories which have been previously thought to be inessential. This keeps scientific practice from being superseded by axiomatic theories. Nevertheless, axiomatic theories continue to play their role as well, and categorical axiomatics of differential geometry have in the meantime grown into a rich, active, and useful research area [8, 9, 12, 11].

Lastly, we also mention the work on entwining structures, which has led our intuitions at various points, although its technical links with this work are less clear. Entwining structures are widely used in mathematical physics to study modules of quantum deformations [10]. A categorical description can be found in the papers by Mesablishvili and Wisbauer [35, 36]. Moerdijk's definition of a Hopf monad in [39] seems to have been an important technical step in these analyses, with possible repercussions on our own work that remain to be explored.

Outline of the paper

In Section 2 we provide a general overview of testing correlations. In Section 3, we summarize the basic ideas about manifolds and their tangents. In Section 4, we apply testing correlations in the context of manifolds to provide the semantic

reconstructions of the of the tangent bundle functors and of the contangent bundle functors, spelled out in Theorem 4.11. The coalgebras for these endofunctors are the usual *cross sections* of the bundle projections, and thus respectively correspond to vector fields (or dynamical systems) and to differential forms. The testing correlations over manifolds thus provides a categorical view of the practice of integration of differential systems over differential forms. In Section 5, we spell out Newton's Second Law as an example of the coalgebraic treatment. Interestingly, the structural duality of the tangent and the cotangent bundles, displayed in the categorical treatment, immediately points beyond Newton, and into relativity theory. An overview of the standard definitions from vector analysis is provided in Appendix A.

2 General testing framework

We begin by reviewing the testing framework from [43].

2.1 Idea

Given a family of systems Σ, a family of tests Θ, and a type Ω of observations, we call a map

$$\Sigma \times \Theta \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} \Omega \tag{1}$$

a *testing correlation*, or just *testing*. The observation $\mathbb{T}(S,t)$ is often written in the infix form $S \models t$. The observations can be boolean, like 'true'/'false', or 'pass'/'fail'; but they can also be quantities obtained from a measurement, e.g. in the interval $[0,1]$, or on the real line $\mathbb{R}$. Each test is assumed to yield a single observation. In the simplest case, we may use testing to distinguish a given system $S \in \Sigma$ from a reference system $R \in \Sigma$. The two systems are observably different if there is a test $b \in \Theta$ such that the observation $R \models b$ is different from the observation $S \models b$. Otherwise, if the two systems induce the same observations for all tests, then they are *observationally indistinguishable*, and we write

$$S \sim R \iff \forall t \in \Theta.(S \models t) = (R \models t)$$

Developing this idea in [40], E.F. Moore suggested that minimal representations of automata can be built over the equivalence classes of their observationally indistinguishable states. This idea was elaborated categorically in [43], by identifying each equivalence class of systems that are observationally indistinguishable from $S \in \Sigma$ with the map $S \models (-) : \Theta \to \Omega$. Such maps can be thought of as the *observable behaviors* of systems. The family L of observable behaviors of systems from Σ can thus be obtained as the image in Ω^Θ of the mapping that

sends each system S to the induced function $S \models (-)$ from tests to observations:



(2)

The main feature of this representation is that the elements of L, with a suitable coalgebraic structure, can be used to build the canonical minimal representatives of the behaviors of the systems in Σ, in so far as they are observable under testing by the tests from Θ. Now we outline the construction of this coalgebraic structure on L, as presented in [43].

2.2 Semantic connections

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a category of 'spaces' and $\mathcal{T}$ be a category of 'types' or 'theories'. A *semantic connection* between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is simply a contravariant adjunction $M^{op} \dashv P : \mathcal{S}^{op} \to \mathcal{T}$. The idea is that a space $X \in \mathcal{S}$ is mapped to the type PX of *predicates* over it, and that a theory $A \in \mathcal{T}$ is mapped to the space MA of its models.

The examples abound. Stone duality motivates the logical view: $\mathcal{T}$ is the category of Boolean algebras, $\mathcal{S}$ is the category of Stone spaces, M maps each Boolean algebra to its space of ultrafilters, which can be viewed as Boolean homomorphisms to 2, whereas P sends each Stone space to its Boolean algebra of open sets, which can be viewed as continuous maps to 2. If we restrict $\mathcal{S}$ from Stone spaces to the category of sets Set, viewed as topological spaces where every subset is open, then $\mathcal{T}$ restricts to the category of complete atomic Boolean algebras, which is equivalent to the opposite category of sets, which yields the self-adjunction of the powerset $\wp^{op} \dashv \wp : \mathsf{Set}^{op} \to \mathsf{Set}$ as another example of a semantic connection. For a different example, let $\mathcal{S}$ be the lattice $\wp\mathbb{R}^n$ of sets of n-tuples of real numbers, $\mathcal{T}$ the lattice $\wp\mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots x_n]$ of sets of real polynomials in n variables, and let M map each set of polynomials to the n-tuples where they are all zero, whereas P should map each set of n-tuples to all polynomials that vanish over it. When restricted to the fixed points of MP and of PM, this semantic connection yields the duality of Zariski closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and of radical ideals in $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots x_n]$.

When they have enough limits and colimits, the two sides of a semantic connection share a *dualizing object* Ω, which lives in both categories as the type $P1$ and the space $M1$ respectively. We can then construct the arrows

$$\frac{\coprod_{|X|} 1 \to X}{PX \to P(\coprod_{|X|} 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{|X|} P1} \qquad \frac{\coprod_{|A|} 1 \to A}{MA \to M(\coprod_{|A|} 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{|A|} M1}$$

where $|C| = \mathsf{C}(1, C)$, and define the functors $\Omega^X := \prod_{|X|} P1$ and $\Omega^A := \prod_{|A|} M1$, to get the natural embeddings

$$PX \rightarrowtail \Omega^X \qquad\qquad MA \rightarrowtail \Omega^A$$

2.3 Testing coalgebras by process algebras

Process logics are modal logics for describing the behavior of computational processes [53, 37, 18]. With the modalities capturing the actions of a process, the formulas of process logics can be constructed as tests: a process *satisfies* a formula if and only if it passes the test that the formula represents. Viewed like this, semantics of process logics generalize the language acceptance definitions, used in the theory of computation to specify how automata and Turing machines compute. In the setting of semantic connections, semantics of process logics, including the various language acceptance definitions, can be captured as follows.

- Present processes as coalgebras in $\mathcal{S}$ for some endofunctor $G : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$.
- Present process logics as algebras in $\mathcal{T}$ for some endofunctor $F : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$.
- Specify the F-algebra semantics of G-coalgebras as a distributivity law $FP \xrightarrow{\lambda} PG$: it lifts the final G-coalgebra $X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX$ into an F-algebra $FPX \xrightarrow{\lambda} PGX \xrightarrow{P\xi} PX$.
- The F-algebra testing of G-coalgebras is realized as the algebra homomorphism from the initial F-algebra $FA \xrightarrow{\alpha} A$ to $FPX \xrightarrow{\lambda} PGX \xrightarrow{P\xi} PX$ in $\mathcal{T}$.
- Transposed along the semantic connection, this algebra homomorphism induces in $\mathcal{S}$ a quotient L of $X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX$, the finest (initial) among all of its quotients that embeds into $MA \xrightarrow{M\alpha} MFA$.
- As an MFP-coalgebra, L provides the canonical representatives of F-observable behaviors of G-processes.

This procedure is our formalization 'in the small' of the idea of Eqn. (2). The coalgebra $X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX$ represents the family of systems Σ, the algebra $FA \xrightarrow{\alpha} A$ represents the family of tests Θ, and the elements of the dualizing object Ω are the available observations. This formalization was elaborated in [43]. We quote the main theorem from that paper, omitting the considerations regarding the initiality of $FA \xrightarrow{\alpha} A$ and the finality of $X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX$.

Theorem 2.1. *For the 'model/predicate' adjunction $M^{op} \dashv P : \mathcal{S}^{op} \to \mathcal{T}$ and endofunctors $G : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$ and $F : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ and a distributive law $\lambda : FP \to PG$ the following holds:*

(a) The predicate functor $P : \mathcal{S}^{op} \to \mathcal{T}$ lifts to $\hat{P} : (\mathcal{S}_G)^{op} \to {}_F\mathcal{T}$

$$\frac{X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX}{\hat{P}\xi : FPX \xrightarrow{\lambda} PGX \xrightarrow{P\xi} PX}\ \text{LIFT} \tag{3}$$

(b) $\hat{P}$ has in general no adjoint, but there is a correspondence

$$\frac{\alpha \longrightarrow \hat{P}\xi}{\Lambda\xi \longrightarrow M\alpha}$$

where $\Lambda : \mathcal{S}_G \to \mathcal{S}_{MFP}$ is the functor mapping the coalgebra $\xi : X \to GX$ to $X \xrightarrow{\xi} GX \xrightarrow{\lambda'} MFPX$. λ' is the twisted distributivity law.



(4)

(c) If $\mathcal{T}$ is a regular category, and $F : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ preserves reflexive coequalizers, then ${}_F\mathcal{T}$ is a regular category. Every F-algebra homomorphism $\alpha \xrightarrow{f} \hat{P}\xi$ has a regular epi-mono factorization.

(d) If $\mathcal{S}^{op}$ is a regular category, and MFP preserves weak pull backs, then every twisted coalgebra homomorphism $f' : \Lambda\xi \to M\alpha$ has a regular epi-mono factorization, which induces a coalgebra $\ell : L \to MFPL$ as the image of $\Lambda\xi$



(5)

Examples. Testing a standard coalgebraic presentation of automata (e.g. [55]) by linear process formulas yields regular languages as the behaviors in L. The MFP-coalgebra structure is induced by the language derivative. Testing the same family of automata by a process logic with branching yields the behaviors modulo the various bisimulation concepts from the branching time spectrum [41, 42]. Testing a coalgebraic version of pushdown automata or Turing machines by linear process formulas yields context-free languages, resp. recursively enumerable languages as the behaviors in L, again with the language derivative as the coalgebra structure. The details are in the Appendix of [43][2]. The approach also extends to nondeterministic and probabilistic systems. The reason why testing coalgebras by algebras turns out to be both so versatile, and also simpler than most of the purely coalgebraic approaches to process semantics, is that it is, in a sense, just a categorical formalization of the familiar practice of defining computational models by specifying state machines on one hand and a language acceptance relation on the other. It should be noted, though, that, e.g., the purely coalgebraic approaches to trace semantics along the lines of [19] are certainly more appropriate for some purposes than our testing trace semantics, while the non-coalgebraic approaches to computability and complexity, e.g. through a monoidal computer [46], are more convenient for other purposes than the coalgebraic Turing machines of [43]. And finally, while all examples discussed so far are concerned with computation, our goal in the present paper is to perhaps make a further step following the ideas of [47], and to provide a coalgebraic reconstruction of some concepts from mathematical analysis.

Vector calculus by testing. It turns out that both vector fields and differential forms can be reconstructed using a simple semantic connection where $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T}$ is the category of manifolds viewed within a topos, and $MX = PX = \mathbb{R}^X$, i.e. the dualizing object, is an object of reals. In this setting, vector fields (or dynamical systems) will be viewed as processes, presented as coalgebras, whereas differential forms can be viewed as tests, and they can be presented as algebras.

3 Elements of vector calculus

3.1 Differentials

One way to establish that two functions behave similarly at a point is to define their *approximation* relation.

Definition 3.1. *Let X and Y be metric spaces with the distance functions $d_X : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $d_Y : Y \times Y \to \mathbb{R}_+$, and let $f, g : X \to Y$ be continuous functions. We say that f and g* approximate *each other at $c \in X$ whenever the*

[2] As mentioned earlier, the Appendix was omitted from the published volume. The original version of the paper is available online.

distance between f and g vanishes at c, i.e.

$$f \underset{c}{\sim} g \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \lim_{x \to c} \frac{d_Y\left(f(x), g(x)\right)}{d_X(x, c)} = 0 \tag{6}$$

For convenience, we list the axioms for metrics in the Appendix. Differential calculus really begins when X and Y are not just metric spaces, but also vector spaces, so that the question of *linear* approximation can be asked. To tie the metric and the linear structure together, it is usually required that the conditions

$$d(x + u, y + u) = d(x, y) \qquad\qquad d(rx, ry) = |r| \cdot d(x, y)$$

hold for all vectors u and all scalars r. Such a distance function on a metric space E can then equivalently be specified using a norm $\| - \| : E \to \mathbb{R}_+$, which is related with $d : E \times E \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\|x\| = d(x, 0) \qquad\qquad d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$$

The axioms for the norm are also in the Appendix. This brings us into the realm of *normed vector spaces*. They are a staple of functional analysis, at least when they are complete under the induced topology: complete normed vector spaces are known as *Banach* spaces. Since our goal here is to reconstruct the concepts of vector calculus from the minimal structural assumptions, we ignore the completeness requirement for the moment. Normed vector spaces, and their conceptual ancestors and origins were studied thoroughly and exhaustively[3] in Grothendieck's thesis [16]. The norm and the linear structure suffice for defining the notion of differential.

Definition 3.2. *Let X and Y be normed vector spaces. The norm structure determines the set $C(X, Y)$ of continuous maps, whereas the vector space structure determines the set $L(X, Y)$ of linear maps. The* differential *of $f \in C(X, Y)$ is the partial operation*

$$\mathbf{D}f : X \rightharpoonup L(X, Y)$$

such that the linear operator $\mathbf{D}f(c)$, whenever it exists, approximates the difference $f(x) - f(c)$, in the sense

$$f(x) - f(c) \quad \underset{c}{\sim} \quad \mathbf{D}f(c)(x - c) \tag{7}$$

where x is a variable and c a constant, i.e. by unfolding (6)

$$\lim_{x \to c} \frac{\|f(x) - f(c) - \mathbf{D}f(c) \cdot (x - c)\|}{\|x - c\|} = 0.$$

The function f is differentiable *if $\mathbf{D}f$ is defined for all $c \in X$. The set of differentiable functions is written $C^1(X, Y)$.*

[3] Grothendieck subsequently left the area, explaining to Malgrange: 'There is nothing more to do, the subject is dead.' [20, p. 1045]

The differentials can in fact be viewed as the linearizations of the equivalence classes modulo the approximation relation (6). The following lemma spells this out formally. The proof is a standard exercise with the norm.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f, g \in C^1(X,Y)$ be differentiable functions between normed vector spaces. Then $f \underset{c}{\sim} g$ holds if and only if $\mathbf{D}f(c) = \mathbf{D}g(c)$ and $f(c) = g(c)$.*

Whenever $L(X,Y)$ is metrizable, and thus a normed vector space, then the differential construction can be iterated, i.e. applied to the differential itself whenever it is continuous and thus $\mathbf{D}f \in C\left(X, L(X,Y)\right)$, leading to

$$\mathbf{D}^2 f = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D}f) \ : X \rightharpoonup L\left(L(X,Y)\right) \cong L\left(X \otimes X, Y\right)$$

Note that $L(X,Y)$ is not metrizable in general, but the peculiar situations when it is not have been characterized in Mackey's work, and clearly spelled out in [16, Ch. 3]. In general, whenever $\mathbf{D}^i f \in C\left(X, L(X^{\otimes n}, Y)\right)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots k$ we define

$$\mathbf{D}^{k+1} f = \mathbf{D}\left(\mathbf{D}^k f\right) \ : X \rightharpoonup L\left(X^{\otimes k+1}, Y\right)$$

and write $f \in C^k(X,Y)$ when f is k times differentiable. The maps which are k times differentiable for all k are in

$$C^\infty(X,Y) \quad = \quad \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} C^k(X,Y)$$

The convention is that $\mathbf{D}^0 f = f$ and $C^0(X,Y) = C(X,Y)$, and of course $L(X^{\otimes 0}, Y) = L(\mathbb{R}, Y) = Y$.

Definition 3.4. *Denote by NVS_k the category where the objects are nonrmed vector spaces and the morphisms are k times differentiable maps, i.e. $\mathsf{NVS}_k(X,Y) = C^k(X,Y)$. The* smooth *morphisms are in $\mathsf{NVS}_\infty(X,Y) = C^\infty(X,Y)$.*

3.2 Manifolds

Vector calculus is built upon the differentials as its main conceptual tool, and largely geared towards computing the linear approximations of differentiable processes. Since nonlinear processes can only be linearly approximated *locally*, the spaces where processes are presented do not have a global linear structure, but only local linear structures. This means that every point has a neighborhood homeomorphic with a normed vector space. This is the idea of *manifold*, going back to Riemann and Poincaré, worked out in modern algebraic topology [14].

Definition 3.5. *A* manifold *is a topological space M whose every point has a neighborhood homeomorphic with convex open subset of a normed vector space. More precisely, a manifold consists of*

- *the underlying topological space M,*

- *a normed vector space E, called* model space*,*
- *an open cover $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i \mid i \in I\}$ of M, i.e. $\bigcup_{i\in I} U_i = M$,*
- *the open embeddings $U_i \overset{\varphi_i}{\rightarrowtail} E$ for all i, with convex images, called* charts*.*

The set $\mathcal{A} = \left\{U_i \overset{\varphi_i}{\rightarrowtail} E \mid i \in I\right\}$ is called the atlas *of the manifold M.*

Remarks. Note that the definition did not mention the differential structure. It will be lifted from normed vector spaces to manifolds in a moment. The point of the current purely *topological* definition is that at each point $x \in M$ the chart $U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ with $U \ni x$ induces a local linear structure; or more precisely, a local *convex* structure, since only the convex combinations of the points in the neighborhood U can be formed[4]. This suffices for defining differentials. In most applications, each vector space E is assumed to be given with a basis, and the charts thus induce the local coordinate systems within M. The spaces E are usually even Euclidean, and thus presented as $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a moment, we stick with abstract normed vector spaces not so much for the sake of generality, as to emphasize what structure is really needed to get differential calculus going. Since normed vector spaces suffice for defining the differential, the charts induce the local differential structures. The only problem is that over the open sets, where the different charts may intersect, different differentials may be induced. The next definition preempts that.

Definition 3.6. *A manifold M is k* times differentiable *if the charts induce the same k-tuple differentials over their intersections. More precisely, for any two charts $U_0 \overset{\varphi_0}{\rightarrowtail} E$ and $U_1 \overset{\varphi_1}{\rightarrowtail} E$ in the atlas of M it is required that the homeomorphism*

$$\phi(U_0 \cap U_1) \xrightarrow{\varphi_0^{-1}} U_0 \cap U_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \varphi_1(U_0 \cap U_1)$$

is k times differentiable, i.e. a C^k-diffeomorphism of the open convex images $\phi_0(U_0 \cap U_1)$ and $\varphi_1(U_0 \cap U_1)$ of $U_0 \cap U_1$. A manifold is smooth *if it is differentiable for all positive integers k, having C^∞-diffeomorphisms..*

A manifold is thus a topological space M with a model space E and an atlas $\mathcal{A}$ that lifts the differentials from E to M. A morphism between k times differentiable manifolds should preserve the k-tuple differentials. To align the continuity with the differentiability of the manifold morphisms, we need to slightly refine the notion of atlas.

Definition 3.7. *The atlas $\mathcal{A}$ of a manifold M is* saturated *if for every chart $U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ in $\mathcal{A}$ and every open subset W of U the restriction $W \hookrightarrow U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ is also an element of $\mathcal{A}$.*

[4]Other reasons and consequences of the convexity requirement on charts are spelled out in [16, Ch. 2].



Figure 1: k-times differentiable map $f : M \to N$

It is easy to see that every atlas has a unique saturation. A saturated atlas allows finding sufficiently small charts.

Definition 3.8. *Let M and N be k times differentiable manifolds with saturated atlases. A continuous map $f : M \to N$ is a k* times differentiable *morphism if for every $x \in M$ and the neighborhoods $V \in f(x)$ and $U \ni x$ such that $U \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$, with the charts $U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ and $V \overset{\psi}{\rightarrowtail} F$ the continuous map*

$$f_{\psi\varphi} : \varphi(U) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1}} U \xrightarrow{f} V \xrightarrow{\psi} \psi(V)$$

is k times differentiable, i.e. $f_{\psi\varphi} = \psi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1} \in C^k(\varphi(U), \psi(V))$. This is illustrated in Fig. 1.

The smooth *morphisms are k times differentiable for all k, i.e. they are the elements of $C^\infty(M, N) = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} C^k(M, N)$.*

The category of k times differentiable manifolds and their morphisms is denoted Man_k. The category of smooth manifolds and smooth morphisms is denoted Man_∞.

Modern vector calculus is largely built using differentiable manifolds [1]. The model spaces E are usually assumed to be Banach spaces, i.e. normed vector spaces that are complete under the induced topology. However, the completeness plays no role in the definitions of manifolds, or even of their tangents and



Figure 2: A tangent vector on the manifold M can be obtained in the form $\vec{v} = \mathbf{D}\varsigma(0) \cdot 1$, where $\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is a suitable curve through the tangent point. By definition, the differential $\mathbf{D}\varsigma(0)$ in M is the differential $\mathbf{D}(\varphi \circ \varsigma)(0)$ in E, where $U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ is a chart at $\varsigma(0)$.

vector fields. It is, of course, essential in solving differential equations and analyzing dynamical systems, but conspicuously unnecessary for describing them.

3.3 Tangent vectors

The idea of a *tangent vector* is that it is the linear approximation of a curve at a given point. In vector calculus, the geometric idea of linear approximation is captured by the concept of the differential. If the curves in a normed vector space are viewed as the differentiable maps from $\mathbb{R}$, then we know from Lemma 3.3 that two curves $\varsigma, \chi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, E)$ through the same point $e = \varsigma(0) = \chi(0)$ have the same differential if and only if $\varsigma \underset{0}{\sim} \chi$. The tangent vectors through a point e of a normed vector space E can thus be viewed as the equivalence classes modulo $\underset{0}{\sim}$. Lifting the differentials from normed vector spaces to manifolds, the tangent vectors on manifolds are defined in the same way, as illustrated on Fig. 2.

Definition 3.9. *A k times* differentiable curve *or* path *on a manifold M is a map $\varsigma \in C^k(\mathbb{R}, M)$.*

Definition 3.10. *A* tangent vector *(or simply* tangent*) over a differentiable manifold M is the equivalence class of paths in M modulo the approximation relation. That is the set of all tangents over M is collected in its* tangent bundle

$$T_*M \quad = \quad C^1(\mathbb{R}, M)/\underset{0}{\sim} \tag{8}$$

The equivalence classes of curves $[\varsigma]_\sim \in T_*M$ are often called linearizations *of their elements.*

The point of collecting the tangents over a manifold M into a bundle is that the tangent bundle T_*M is a manifold again, and that dynamical systems can be presented as suitable manifold morphisms $M \to T_*M$. While this provides a useful high level view of dynamical systems, the direct implementation of this idea requires working with the low level representations of the tangents, and unfolding charts and atlases over and over again. To give the reader a flavor of this implementation, we sketch it in the rest of this section. In the next section, we propose a high level view of tangent bundles, as behaviors recognized through testing.

3.3.1 The tangent bundle functor T_*

By definition, the elements of the tangent bundles are the equivalence classes of curves $[\varsigma]_\sim$, where $\varsigma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, M)$ is a representative. By mapping each tangent $[\varsigma]_\sim$ to the point where it touches the manifold, we get the projection

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \varepsilon \ : \ T_*M & \to & M \\ [\varsigma]_\sim & \mapsto & \varsigma(0) \end{array} \tag{9}$$

which is well defined by Lemma 3.3. We need to lift to T_*M not just the topology, but also the atlas from M. Towards that goal, let us first consider a very special case.

Lemma 3.11. *Consider an open set U in a normed vector space E as a manifold, with the obvious chart. Then $T_*U \cong U \times E$.*

Proof sketch. Since the linearization of the path $\varsigma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, E)$ at $\varsigma(0)$ is generally given by evaluating the differential $\mathbf{D}\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to L(\mathbb{R}, E) = E$ at 0 to get $\mathbf{D}\varsigma(0) \in E$, in this particular case we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T_*U & \to & U \times E \\ [\varsigma]_\sim & \mapsto & \langle \varsigma(0), \mathbf{D}\varsigma(0) \cdot 1 \rangle \end{array} \tag{10}$$

where 1 is the unit vector at 0 in $\mathbb{R}$. □

Proposition 3.12. *T_*M carries a canonical manifold structure which restricts to its open submanifolds*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_*U & \rightarrowtail & T_*M \\ {\scriptstyle\varepsilon}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\varepsilon} \\ U & \hookrightarrow & M \end{array} \tag{11}$$

If M is a k times differentiable manifold, then T_*M is $k-1$ times differentiable.

Proof sketch. Suppose that the manifold M is given with the atlas

$$\mathcal{A} \quad = \quad \left\{ U_i \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} E \mid i \in I \right\}$$

We claim that

$$T_*\mathcal{A} \quad = \quad \left\{ U_i \times E \xrightarrow{\varphi_i \times E} E \times E \mid i \in I \right\}$$

is the atlas for T_*M which restricts to M's submanifolds as claimed. For each linearization $[\varsigma]_\sim \in T_*M$, the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ gives $\langle U, \varphi \rangle \in \mathcal{A}(\varsigma(0))$. In the neighborhood of $q = \varsigma(0)$ the paths ς and $\varphi \circ \varsigma$ can be used interchangeably. But $\delta = \varphi \circ \varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to \varphi(U)$ is given by $\delta(t) = \varphi(\varsigma(0)) + t\,\mathbf{D}(\varphi \circ \varsigma)(0) \cdot e$ and δ is completely determined by $\langle \varphi(\varsigma(0)), v \rangle$, with $v = \mathbf{D}(\varphi \circ \varsigma)(0) \cdot e = D \cdot e \in E$. Thus the cylinder over $\phi(U)$ is a neighborhood in T_*M, i.e. $\phi(U) \times E \in \mathcal{N}\left([\varsigma]_\sim\right)$. □

Proposition 3.12 determines the object part of the functor $T_* : \mathsf{Man}_{k+1} \to \mathsf{Man}_k$. The arrow part is defined along the same lines.

Definition 3.13. *Define the category of* basic *manifolds with k times differentiable maps* BMan_k *as follows:*

- *the objects are pairs $\langle U, E \rangle$ where E is a normed vector space, and $U \subseteq E$ is an open convex subset;*
- *the morphisms $\langle U, E \rangle \xrightarrow{f} \langle V, F \rangle$ are the k times differentiable maps $f \in C^k(E, F)$ such that $f(U) \subseteq V$.*

The category BMan_∞ *has the same objects, but the morphisms are smooth, i.e.* $\mathsf{BMan}_\infty(M, N) = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{BMan}_k(M, N)$.

Proposition 3.14. *The following mappings define a functor $T_* : \mathsf{BMan}_{k+1} \to \mathsf{BMan}_k$*

$$\begin{array}{c} U \subseteq E \\ \big\downarrow \\ U \times E \end{array} \quad , \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} U \subseteq E & \xrightarrow{\qquad f \qquad} & V \subseteq F \\ \big\downarrow & & \big\downarrow \\ U \times E & \xrightarrow[T_*f\,=\,\langle f \circ \pi_0,\, \mathbf{D}f(\pi_0) \cdot \pi_1 \rangle]{} & V \times F; \end{array}$$

Restricted to the smooth morphisms in Ban_∞*, the above construction gives the endofunctor $T_* : \mathsf{BMan}_\infty \to \mathsf{BMan}_\infty$.*

Proof. We need to check that the arrow part of the construction is functorial. The fact that $T_*(\mathrm{id}) = \mathrm{id}$ follows from Lemma 3.15 below. By unfolding the definition, which says that

$$T_*f(q, v) \quad = \quad \langle f(q), \mathbf{D}f(0) \cdot v \rangle$$

and using the chain rule (proved in the usual way) for the differential from Def. 3.2, we prove the claim:

$$\begin{aligned} T_*(f \circ g)(q, v) &= \big\langle f(g(q)), \mathbf{D}(f \circ g)(q) \cdot v \big\rangle \\ &= \big\langle f(g(q)), \mathbf{D}f(g(q)) \cdot \mathbf{D}g(q) \cdot v \big\rangle \\ &= T_*f\,(g(q), \mathbf{D}g(q) \cdot v) \\ &= (T_*f \circ T_*g)\,(q, v) \end{aligned}$$

□

Remarks. This exhibits the fact that $T_*(f \circ g) = T_*(f) \circ T_*(g)$ is locally equivalent to the chain rule. The projection

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathsf{BMan}_k & \to & \mathsf{NVS}_k \\ \langle U, E \rangle & \mapsto & E \end{array}$$

makes each BMan_k into a fibered category over NVS_k. It is important to note that T_* is not a lifting of the squaring functor

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} S & : & \mathsf{BMan}_k & \to & \mathsf{BMan}_k \\ & & X & \mapsto & X \times X \end{array}$$

although the object part of T_* defined above, mapping $U \subseteq E$ to $U \times E$, might suggest that it is. But the arrow part is obviously different: while the squaring functor maps $f \mapsto f \times f$, the second component of T_*f is not f, but its linear approximation.

Lemma 3.15. *$T_*f = f \times f$ if and only if f is linear.*

Proposition 3.16. *The functors $T_* : \mathsf{BMan}_{k+1} \to \mathsf{BMan}_k$ have unique extensions to $T_* : \mathsf{Man}_{k+1} \to \mathsf{Man}_k$ along the inclusions of basic manifolds into differentiable manifolds in general:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{BMan}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{T_*} & \mathsf{BMan}_k \\ \big\downarrow & & \big\downarrow \\ \mathsf{Man}_{k+1} & \overset{T_*}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathsf{Man}_k \end{array}$$

Proof. The object part of the extension maps the $k+1$ times differentiable manifolds M to the tangent bundles T_*M as described in Def. 3.10, with the manifold structure described in Prop. 3.12. Towards the arrow part, for any $f \in \mathsf{Man}_{k+1}(M, N)$ and any tangent $[\varsigma]_\sim \in T_*M$ represented by a differentiable curve $\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to M$, define

$$T_*f\,([\varsigma]_\sim) = [f \circ \varsigma]_\sim \tag{12}$$

The fact that this definition is sound, i.e. that $\varsigma \sim \varsigma'$ over M implies $f \circ \varsigma \sim f \circ \varsigma'$ over N follows from Lemma 3.3, using the chain rule. The fact that T_*f is a k times differentiable manifold homomorphism, i.e. in $\mathsf{Man}_k\left(T_*M, T_*N\right)$, follows from the fact that it restricts to $T_*f_U \in \mathsf{BMan}_k\left(T_*U, T_*V\right)$ for all corresponding charts $U \overset{\varphi}{\rightarrowtail} E$ of M and $V \overset{\psi}{\rightarrowtail} F$ of N and the restriction $f_U \in \mathsf{BMan}_k\left(U, V\right)$ constructed as in Figure 1. They make the top trapezoid in the following diagram commutative.



(13)

The trapezoids on the sides commute as in (11), whereas the square in the middle commutes by Lemma 3.17, proved below. The bottom trapezoid then shows how T_*f, defined in (12), restricts to a mapping on the charts as defined in Prop. 3.12. Tracking these restrictions around Figure 1 again, we see that T_*f is locally glued from the differentials $\langle f\pi_0, \mathbf{D}f \cdot \pi_1\rangle$. If f is $k+1$ times differentiable, then $\mathbf{D}f$ is k times differentiable, and thus each restriction of T_*f to a submanifold $T_*U = U \times E$ of T_*M is k times differentiable. Therefore, T_*f must be k times differentiable itself. □

Lemma 3.17. *The maps $\varepsilon_M : T_*M \to M$ defined in* (9)*, are natural when M ranges over the basic manifolds U. Thus $\varepsilon : T_* \to \mathrm{Id}$ is a natural transformation between the endofunctors on BMan_∞.*

Proof. Unfolding the definitions



shows that projecting curves to their points $\varepsilon_U\left([\gamma]_\sim\right) = \varsigma(0)$, when restricted to basic manifolds U, boils down to the projections $\varepsilon = \pi_0 : U \times E \to U$. □

Just another look at diagram (13) gives

Corollary 3.18. *The maps $\varepsilon_M : T_*M \to M$ form a natural transformation $\varepsilon : T_* \to \mathrm{Id}$ between endofunctors on Man_∞.*

Proceeding along the same lines, we could further construct the natural transformation $\delta : T_* \to T_*T_*$, first for T_* as an endofunctor on BMan_∞, where $T_*U \cong U \times E$, and thus

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \delta & : & T_*U & \to & T_*T_*U \\ & & \langle u, e\rangle & \mapsto & \langle u, e, e\rangle \end{array} \tag{14}$$

and then extending this along (11) to T_* as an endofunctor on Man_∞. Remarkably, though, the natural transformation $T_* \xrightarrow{\delta} T_*T_*$ is coassociative, but not counitary with respect to $T_* \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathrm{Id}$ and therefore does not make T_* into a comonad. The reason is why it is not counitary, studied in more detail in [21] is that all natural transformations between nontrivial powers of T_* must preserve the zeros, as the trivial splitting of $T_*M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$. Vector fields over a manifold M can be viewed as the general splittings of $T_*M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$, usually called *cross sections*; but they do not embed into $T_*M \xrightarrow{\delta} T_*T_*M$ as the cofree one, and they are thus not coalgebras of a monad, but just a special kind of coalgebras of the functor $T_* : \mathsf{Man}_\infty \to \mathsf{Man}_\infty$.

The whole process of functorializing tangent bundles, studied in the literature at many levels of generality and abstraction, can be repeated for cotangent bundles, leading to a cotangent bundle functor $T_\# : \mathsf{Man}_\infty \to \mathsf{Man}_\infty$ with a similar structure. While a tangent vector over a manifold M is a $\sim$-equivalence class of curves $\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to M$, a cotangent vector is a $\sim$-equivalence class of differentiable functions $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$. Just like vector fields can be presented as coalgebras $M \to T_*M$ such that the composite $M \to T_*M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$ is the identity, differential forms can be presented as coalgebras $M \to T_\#M$ such that the composite $M \to T_\#M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$ is the identity. Vector analysis is thus developed by using them together, and the cotangent bundle $T_\#M$ is usually defined as the dual of the tangent bundle T_*M. At a closer look, it turns out that both the tangent and the contangent vectors arise by *testing*, in the sense of Sec. 2, of the differentiable functions $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ along the curves $\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to M$. This provides a high level view of both constructions, which we present in the next section.

4 Tangent and cotangent testing

4.1 Manifolds as sheaves

Let M be a manifold with a saturated atlas $\mathcal{A}_M$. The fact that the atlas is saturated means that it can be presented as a *presheaf*, i.e. a functor mapping each open set $U \subseteq M$ to the set of charts over it, i.e.

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathcal{A}_M & : & \mathcal{O}(M)^{op} & \to & \mathsf{Set} \\ & & U & \mapsto & \{U \xrightarrow{\varphi} E\} \end{array} \tag{15}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(M)$ is the set of opens in M, viewed as a partial order the under inclusion[5]. If the model space E is given with some chosen coordinates $E \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^X$, then every k times differentiable chart can be viewed as an X-tuple of k times differentiable maps $U \to \mathbb{R}$, since there is the correspondence

$$\frac{U \xrightarrow{\varphi} E \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^X}{U \times X \xrightarrow{\varphi \times X} E \times X \to \mathbb{R}}$$

By viewing each k times differentiable chart as an X-tuple of k times differentiable functions to $\mathbb{R}$, we can present the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ as the subfunctor of the sheaf of k times differentiable functions:

$$\begin{array}{rcccc} C^k(M) & : & \mathcal{O}(M)^{op} & \to & \mathsf{Set} \\ & & U & \mapsto & C^k(U) \end{array} \tag{16}$$

This is spelled out in [33, Sec. II.3]. When M is a second countable Hausdorff space, then all of the structure of the manifold M can be reconstructed from a subsheaf $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow C^k(M)$. Giving a k times differentiable manifold on M is equivalent to giving a subsheaf of $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow C^k(M)$ with the property that U embeds into $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}U}$ for every U. Note, though, that the atlases of the manifolds presented like this are not only saturated, but also *sheafified*, i.e. they contain not only all subcharts of their charts, but also all unions of their charts that can be consistently glued together [57, 2.4]. But since every saturated atlas has a sheafification [33, Sec. III.5], and the atlases that lead in this way to the same associated sheaf are just different presentations of diffeomorphic manifolds, this leads to no loss of generality. Sheaves thus provide a uniform presentation of manifolds, eliminating the irrelevant implementation details which allow different atlases for diffeomorphic, and thus indistinguishable manifolds. This is, of course, not an accident, since the concept of manifold was one of the guiding ideas behind the concept of sheaf [32].

The main technical advantage of the sheaf presentation is that manifolds can now be studied in the rich environment of Grothendieck's *toposes* [3]. This is where the tangent and cotangent bundle functors will emerge from testing.

The idea of a topos of sheaves $\mathsf{Sh}(X)$ over a topological space X is that it is a *generalized view* of the space M. From one angle, this view is supported by presenting sheaves as *continuosly variable sets* [30], i.e. the contravariant functors $\mathcal{O}(X)^{op} \to \mathsf{Set}$ satisfying the sheaf requirement ([57, 2.1] or [33, Sec. II.1]), analogous to the above requirement that all consistent charts are glued together. The category $\mathsf{Sh}(X)$ is then viewed as a reflective subcategory of the functor category $\mathsf{Set}^{\mathcal{O}(X)^{op}}$. From a different angle, sheaves over a space X are equivalently presented as *étale spaces*, i.e. local homeomorphisms $E \to X$ ([57, Sec. 2.3] or [33, Sec. II.6]). The functor category $\mathsf{Sh}(X) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Set}^{\mathcal{O}(X)^{op}}$ is thus equivalent with the category of étale spaces $\mathcal{E}/X \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Esp}/X$, where Esp is the

[5] A partial order like $(\mathcal{O}(M), \subseteq)$ is a category with at most one morphism $U \to V$, which exists just when $U \subseteq V$

category of topological spaces. This latter presentation brings the sheaves over different spaces X together in the category Top whose objects are étale spaces $E \xrightarrow{p} X$, while the morphisms are commutative squares formed by the parallel pairs of continuous maps $\langle e, b\rangle$ that make the square commute in the next diagram.

$$\text{Obj:}\quad \begin{array}{c} E \\ {\scriptstyle p}\downarrow \\ X \end{array} \qquad\qquad \text{Mor:}\quad \begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\ e\ } & E' \\ {\scriptstyle p}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p'} \\ X & \xrightarrow{\ b\ } & X' \end{array} \tag{17}$$

The category Top can be construed of as a crude version of Grothendieck's 'gros topos' [3, IV.2.5], along the lines of [31].

Proposition 4.1. *There is a faithful functor $\mathsf{Man}_k \rightarrowtail \mathsf{Top}$ for every k. It is full for $k = 0$.*

Proof. Each manifold M is presented as the étale space $E \to M$ corresponding to the sheaf $\mathcal{A}_M$ from (15). The fact that the manifold morphisms are just the continuous maps that preserve the fibers follows directly from the definition of $\mathcal{A}_M$ as tracking the charts over M, and the construction of the points of $E \to M$ as the neighborhood filters through these charts. □

4.2 Paths and tests

The upshot of the presentation of manifolds as sheaves is that the category Man can thus be viewed as a subcategory of Top. Moreover, the forgetful functor $\mathsf{Top} \to \mathsf{Esp}$, mapping each étale space $E \to X$ to its base space X, is a fibration, whose fibers are equivalent to the 'petit toposes' $\mathsf{Sh}(X)$.

Each of them contains the constant sheaf $\mathbb{R}$ of real numbers. The differentiable paths $\mathbb{R} \to M$ and the differentiable tests $M \to \mathbb{R}$ can now be internalized as sheaves.

Definition 4.2. *Given a k times differentiable manifold M, let the presheaves $\Sigma M, \Theta M : \mathcal{O}M^{op} \to \mathsf{Set}$ be defined by*

$$\Sigma M(U) \;=\; \mathsf{Man}_k(\widehat{U} \times \mathcal{A}_M, \mathbb{R}) \tag{18}$$

$$\Theta M(U) \;=\; \mathsf{Man}_k(\widehat{U} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{A}_M) \tag{19}$$

Setting $\Sigma_* M = \Sigma M$ and $\Theta^* M = \Theta_\# M = \Theta M$ determines the object parts of the functors

$$\Sigma_*, \Theta_\# \;:\; \mathsf{Man}_k \to \mathsf{Top} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \Theta^* \;:\; \mathsf{Man}_k^{op} \to \mathsf{Top}$$

Given a k times differentiable map $h \in \mathsf{Man}_k(M, N)$, the arrow parts will be

defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \Sigma_* h(U) \;:\; \Sigma_* M(U) & \to & \Sigma_* N(U) & (20) \\ \varsigma & \mapsto & h \circ \varsigma & \\ \Theta^* h(U) \;:\; \Theta^* N(U) & \to & \Theta^* M(U) & (21) \\ t & \mapsto & t \circ \langle \mathrm{id}, h \rangle & \\ \Theta_\# h(U) \;:\; \Theta_\# M(U) & \to & \Theta_\# N(U) & (22) \\ s & \mapsto & \Theta_\# h(U)_s(u,y) = \bigvee_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \bigwedge_{\|h(x)-y\| \leq \varepsilon} s(u,x) & \end{array}$$

where $\varsigma \in \mathsf{Man}_k(\widehat{U} \times \mathbb{R}, M)$ *is a path in* M *whereas* $t \in \mathsf{Man}_k(\widehat{U} \times N, \mathbb{R})$ *and* $s \in \mathsf{Man}_k(\widehat{U} \times M, \mathbb{R})$ *are tests over* $x \in M$ *and* $y \in N$*.*

Remark. Since the inclusion $\mathsf{Sh}(X) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Set}^{\mathcal{O}(X)^{op}}$ has a left exact left adjoint [33, Sec. III.5][6] the exponents of $\mathsf{Sh}(X)$ are created in $\mathsf{Set}^{\mathcal{O}(X)^{op}}$. For $A, B \in \mathsf{Sh}(X)$, the exponent is thus

$$B^A(U) \quad = \quad \mathsf{Sh}(\widehat{U} \times A, B)$$

Comparing this with (18) and (19), it is clear that ΘM is a subsheaf of the sheaf $\mathbb{R}^M$, whereas ΣM is a subsheaf of $M^{\mathbb{R}}$, where we abuse notation and write M for the sheaf $\mathcal{A}_M$, representing the manifold M.

Convention. To simplify notation, when reasoning about sheaves and their morphisms, we often leave the variation over the open sets $U \subseteq M$ implicit. This is formally justified not only for the global constructions, but also for the local constructions that are expressible in the internal language of topos [33, Ch. VI].

Proposition 4.3. *The inclusions*

$$\Sigma_* M \hookrightarrow M^{\mathbb{R}} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \Theta^* M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$$

are natural in M*, where the functors*

$$(-)^{\mathbb{R}} : \mathsf{Man}_k \to \mathsf{Top} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \mathbb{R}^{(-)} : \mathsf{Man}_k^{op} \to \mathsf{Top}$$

are obtained by restricting the exponentiation from the fibres of Top*.*

The proof of the preceding proposition boils down to unfolding the arrow part of the restriction $\mathbb{R}^{(-)} : \mathsf{Man}_k^{op} \to \mathsf{Top}$ of the exponentiation functors in the toposes $\mathsf{Sh}(M)$, which is identical to (20) and (21). The next proposition, however, requires that we define the covariant version $\mathbb{R}^{(-)}_\# : \mathsf{Man}_k \to \mathsf{Top}$,

[6] The topos theory results that we use are contained in most topos theory textbooks. The choice of the one that we keep referring to is entirely a matter of personal habit, and the reader may wish to consult any of the other presentations.

which is just the exponentiation on the objects, but maps every differentiable morphism $h \in \mathsf{Man}_k(M,N)$ to the internal left adjoint of $\mathbb{R}^h$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{R}^h_\# \dashv \mathbb{R}^h \quad : \quad \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^M$$

Definition 4.4. *The covariant functor $\mathbb{R}^{(-)}_\# : \mathsf{Man}_k \to \mathsf{Top}$ maps each manifold M to the sheaf $\mathbb{R}^M$, and maps each $h \in \mathsf{Man}_k(M,N)$ to*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathbb{R}^h_\#(U) \ : \ \mathbb{R}^M(U) & \to & \mathbb{R}^N(U) \\ s & \mapsto & \mathbb{R}^h_\#(U)_s(u,y) = \bigwedge\limits_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \bigvee\limits_{\|h(x)-y\| \leq \varepsilon} s(u,x) \end{array} \tag{23}$$

Lemma 4.5. *The direct images along the morphisms with nonzero differentials are injective, modulo the approximation relation. More precisely, for every $h \in C^1(M,N)$ and every $c \in M$ such that $\mathbf{D}h(c) \neq 0$ holds*

$$\mathbb{R}\left(\mathbb{R}_\#(h)_t\right) \underset{c}{\sim} t \tag{24}$$

$$T^*\left(T_\#(h)_t\right) \underset{c}{\sim} t \tag{25}$$

where we write $\mathbb{R}_\#(h)$ for $\mathbb{R}^h_\#$ and $\mathbb{R}(g)$ for $\mathbb{R}^g$.

Proof of 4.5 (24). Omitting the sheaf variation along $U \subseteq M$, as it plays no role here, for all z in the neighborhood of c holds

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \mathbb{R}\left(\mathbb{R}_\#(h)_t\right)(z) & = & \bigwedge\limits_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \bigvee\limits_{\|h(x)-h(z)\| \leq \varepsilon} t(x) & \underset{z}{\sim} \\ & \underset{z}{\sim} & \bigwedge\limits_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \bigvee\limits_{\mathbf{D}h(z)\|x-z\| \leq \varepsilon} t(x) & \\ & = & t(z) & \end{array}$$

□

Proposition 4.6. *The inclusions*

$$\Theta_\# M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^M_\#$$

are natural in M with respect to all continuously *differentiable morphisms $h : M \to N$.*

Proof. The claim is that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Theta_\# M & \xrightarrow{\dashv} & \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M} \\ {\scriptstyle \Theta_\# h}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbb{R}^f_\#} \\ \Theta_\# N & \xrightarrow[\dashv]{} & \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* N} \end{array} \tag{26}$$

commutes for every continuously differentiable h. Going down and right gives

$$\left(\Theta_{\#}h(t) \underset{N}{\rightrightarrows} \tau\right) \quad = \quad \mathbf{D}\left(\bigwedge_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \bigvee_{\|h(x)-\tau(r)\|\leq\varepsilon} t(x)\right)_r (0) \tag{27}$$

where $t \in \Theta_{\#}M(U)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* N}(U)$ and the function under the differential operator varies over $r \in \mathbb{R}$. We omit the variable $u \in U$ on both sides, since the equation holds pointwise in it. Going right and down in (26) gives

$$\mathbb{R}^h_{\#}(U)_{\widehat{t}}(\tau) \quad = \quad \bigwedge_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \bigvee_{\|h(\varsigma(0))-\tau(0)\|\leq\varepsilon} \widehat{t}(\varsigma) \tag{28}$$

where the supremum is taken over $\varsigma \in \Sigma_* M$ and $\widehat{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M}$ is defined to be

$$\widehat{t}(\varsigma) \quad = \quad \left(t \underset{M}{\rightrightarrows} \varsigma\right) \quad = \quad \mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma)(0)$$

Substituting ς into $\widehat{t}$ and putting (27) and (28) together, the commutativity of (26) thus boils down to

$$\mathbf{D}\left(\bigwedge_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \bigvee_{\|h(x)-\tau(0)\|\leq\varepsilon} t(x)\right)(0) \quad = \quad \bigwedge_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \bigvee_{\|h(\varsigma(0))-\tau(0)\|\leq\varepsilon} \mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma)(0)$$

the first supremum is taken over $x \in M$ and the second one over $\varsigma \in \Sigma_* M$. This equation holds as soon as h, t and ς are continuously differentiable. □

Remark. Note that $\bigwedge_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \bigvee_{\|h(x)-y\|\leq\varepsilon} g(x)$ is here just $\limsup_{y\to h(x)} g(x)$ and that the differential of a real function $y : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ depending on x is just the slope of its tangent, i.e. the usual derivative $\mathbf{D}y = \frac{dy}{dx}$.

4.3 Tangent testing correlation

We are now in the position to define a testing correlation like in (1) between the paths and the tests in a manifold M.

Definition 4.7. *The* testing correlation *for differentiable manifold M is the morphism $\mathbb{T}$ in $\mathsf{Sh}(M)$*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Sigma M \times \Theta M & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} & \mathbb{R} \\ \langle \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\varsigma} M, M \xrightarrow{t} \mathbb{R} \rangle & \mapsto & \mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma)(0) \end{array} \tag{29}$$

Lemma 4.8. *The testing correlations are dinatural, in the sense that every differentiable manifold morphism $f : M \to N$ makes the following diagram commute.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_* M \times \Theta^* N & \xrightarrow{\Sigma_* f \times \mathrm{id}} & \Sigma_* N \times \Theta^* N \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id} \times \Theta^* f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbb{T}} \\ \Sigma_* M \times \Theta^* M & \xrightarrow[\mathbb{T}]{} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

Proof. $\mathbb{T}(\varsigma, \Theta^* f(t)) = \mathbf{D}(t \circ f \circ \varsigma)(0) = \mathbb{T}(\Sigma_* f(\varsigma), t)$ □

Recall from Sec. 2.1 that $\mathbb{T}(\varsigma, t)$ is also written in the infix forms

$$\Sigma M \xrightarrow{\models} \mathbb{R}^{\Theta M} \quad : \quad \varsigma \mapsto (t \mapsto (\varsigma \models t))$$

$$\Theta M \xrightarrow{=\!|} \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma M} \quad : \quad t \mapsto (\varsigma \mapsto (t =\!| \varsigma))$$

Lemma 4.8 now immediately imples

Corollary 4.9. *The testing correlations induce the natural transformations*

$$\Sigma_* \xrightarrow{\models} \mathbb{R}^{\Theta^*} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \Theta^* \xrightarrow{=\!|} \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_*}$$

Proceeding as in (2), we define the 'observable behaviors' of the paths in ΣM and of the tests in ΘM by the epi-mono factorizations in Top

(30)

Proposition 4.10. *If M is a $k+1$ times differentiable manifold, then the sheaves T_*M and T^*M defined in* (30) *are k times differentiable manifolds: T_*M is just the tangent bundle of M, whereas T^*M is the cotangent bundle.*

Proof. The claim that the quotient T_*M defined in (30) on the left is the same as the tangent bundle T_*M defined in Sec. 3 formally means that for any two differentiable curves $\varsigma, \varsigma' \in C^{k+1}(\mathbb{R}, M)$ through the same point $\varsigma(0) = \varsigma'(0)$ holds

$$\varsigma \underset{0}{\sim} \varsigma' \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \forall t \in C^{k+1}(M, \mathbb{R}).\ \mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma)(0) = \mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma')(0)$$

But this follows from Lemma 3.3.

The claim that the quotient T^*M defined in (30) on the right is the usual cotangent bundle manifold T^*M, i.e. that it consists of the cotangent vectors, dual to the tangent vectors in T_*M, is clear from the construction of the quotient T^*M, which is dual to the construction of T_*M. □

4.4 Main theorem

Theorem 4.11. *The factorizations in* (30) *determine the functors*

$$T_*, T_\# \ : \ \mathsf{Man}_\infty \to \mathsf{Man}_\infty \qquad \textit{and} \qquad T^* \ : \ \mathsf{Man}_\infty^{op} \to \mathsf{Man}_\infty$$

with $T_\# M = T^* M$ on the objects, and such that

- T_* *is a monad,*
- $T_\#$ *is a comonad, and*
- T^* *is self-adjoint.*

The proof of the theorem occupies the rest of this section.

4.4.1 The arrow part of T_* and T^*

To define the arrow part of the functors T_* and T^*, let M and N be smooth manifolds, and $f \in \mathsf{Man}_\infty(M, N)$ a smooth map between them. Consider the following diagrams:



(31)

The back squares in both diagrams commute by Corrolary 4.9. The orthogonality of the monics and the epics in the factorizatons in (30) then induces the unique maps $T_* f$ and $T^* f$. The functoriality of Σ_* and Θ^* guarantees the functoriality of T_* and T^*.

4.4.2 The arrow part of $T_\#$

To define the arrow part of the covariant cotangent bundle functor $T_\#$, consider



(32)

This time, the back square commutes by Prop. 4.6, and the functor thus depends on the direct images in the definitons of $\Theta_\#$ and $\mathbb{R}_\#^{\Sigma_*(-)}$. The uniqueness and the functoriality of the definition of $T_\# f$ follow from the same reasons as above.

4.4.3 The bundle map $T_* \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathrm{Id}$

The bundle projection $\varepsilon : T_*M \to M$ is constructed using the orthogonality of the monics and the epis again



where the top is the definition of T_*M, the diagonal map is the projection

$$\epsilon(\varsigma) \quad = \quad \varsigma(0) \tag{33}$$

and the incusion m' is defined as follows:

$$\frac{\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M} \times M \xrightarrow{\mathbb{R}^\iota \times M} \mathbb{R}^M \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}}{M \xrightarrow{m'} \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M}}}$$

The map $\mathbb{R}_\#^{\Rightarrow\!|}$ is the image of the testing correlation along the covariant exponentiation functor from (23), i.e.

$$\frac{\Theta^* M \xrightarrow{\Rightarrow\!|} \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M}}{\mathbb{R}^{\Theta^* M} \underset{\mathbb{R}_!^{\Rightarrow\!|}}{\overset{\mathbb{R}^{\Rightarrow\!|}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M}}} \tag{34}$$

The natural transformation $\delta : T_*M \to T_*T_*M$ can be derived using the orthogonality of the factorization:



where

$$\gamma(\varsigma)(y) \quad = \quad \varsigma + \mathbf{D}\varsigma(0) \cdot y$$

and ϵ is as in (33). This is not a comonad coevaluation, as it does not split εT_*.

4.4.4 The monad structure $T_*T_* \xrightarrow{\mu} T_* \xleftarrow{\eta} \mathrm{Id}$

The monad structure on T_* is induced by

- the bundle projections $\varepsilon : T_*M \to M$ from Sec 4.4.3 and the
- the 'candidate units' $\eta_\Sigma : M \xrightarrow{\Sigma} M$ where $\eta_\Sigma x(r) = x$



Remark. The monad structure over T_* has been spelled out in the classical framework in [21], and studied in of Synthetic Differential Geometry in [11].

4.4.5 The comonad structure $T_\# T_\# \xleftarrow{\delta} T_\# \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathrm{Id}$

Towards the definition of the bundle structure map $\varepsilon : T_\# M \to M$, define for each $x \in M$ the subsheaf $\Sigma_x M$ of $\Sigma_* M$ by setting

$$\Sigma_x M \quad = \quad \{\varsigma \in \Sigma_* M \mid \varsigma(0) = x\} \tag{35}$$

Since $\Sigma_* M$ thus decomposes into the coproduct

$$\Sigma_* M \quad = \quad \coprod_{x \in M} \Sigma_x M$$

the cotangent bundle embeds into the product



(36)

The quotient bundle T^xM of $T^*M = T_\#M$ thus consists of the equivalence classes of the tests on M that are indistinguishable by the paths through x. Note, however, that, since $\mathbb{R}$ is an injective object of $\mathsf{Sh}(M)$, the projections $\prod_{z\in M}\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_z M} \xrightarrow{\pi_x} \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_x M}$ split by the injections $\iota_x : \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_x M} \xrightarrow{\iota_x} \prod_{z\in M}\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_z M}$. The splitting means that $\pi_x \circ \iota_x = \mathrm{id}$ holds. Intuitively, ι_x maps $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_x M}$ to the family $\iota_x(\tau) = \langle \iota\tau_z \rangle_{z\in M}$ where $\iota\tau_z = \tau$ if $z = x$ and $\iota\tau_z = 0$ otherwise. T^xM is thus a submanifold of $\prod_{z\in M}\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_z M}$, and hence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Theta M & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \\ T^xM & \rightarrowtail & \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_x M} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota_x} \\ T^*M & \rightarrowtail & \prod_{z\in M}\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_z M} \end{array} \tag{37}$$

Since the inclusions $T^xM \hookrightarrow T^*M$ are jointly surjective, we have

$$T^*M \quad = \quad \coprod_{x\in M} T^xM$$

Recalling that $T_\#$ is the covariant version of T^*, i.e. that $T_\#M = T^*M$ on the objects, we construct $\varepsilon : T_\#M \to M$ by projecting each T^xM to $x \in M$. The coevaluation $\delta : T_\#M \to T_\#T_\#M$ follows by using the contravariant functors Θ^* and $\mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_*}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Theta^*M & \twoheadrightarrow & T_\#M & \rightarrowtail & \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* M} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Theta^*\varepsilon} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_*\varepsilon}} \\ \Theta^*T_\#M & \twoheadrightarrow & T_\#T_\#M & \rightarrowtail & \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma_* T_\# M} \end{array} \tag{38}$$

The naturality and the comonad conditions for the families

$$M \xleftarrow{\varepsilon} T_\#M \xrightarrow{\delta} T_\#T_\#M$$

follow from Lemma 4.5.

Remark. Just like the tangent bundle functor allowed a 'coevaluation candidate' $T_* \xrightarrow{\delta} T_*T_*$ which turned out to be degenerate, the cotangent bundle allows a degenerate 'evaluation candidate' $T_\#T_\# \xrightarrow{\mu} T_\#$. While both candidacies fail, they may be pointing towards a structure that still waits to be understood.

4.4.6 T^* is self-adjoint

The claim is that there is a correspondence

$$\mathsf{Man}_\infty(M, T^*N) \quad \cong \quad \mathsf{Man}_\infty(N, T^*M)$$

natural in M and N. By the definition in (30), the manifold T^*N consists of the equivalence classes of tests in $\mathbb{R}^N$ indistinuishable by smooth paths in $N^{\mathbb{R}}$. On the other hand, two smooth morphisms $f, g \in \mathsf{Man}_\infty(M, M')$ that are indistinguishable by smooth paths in M' must be equal. So a morphism $f \in \mathsf{Man}_\infty(M, T^*N)$, unfolded to a function $\widehat{f} : M \times N \to \mathbb{R}$, is a representative of the equivalence classes modulo the same testing along each of the arguments. Although this function is not a manifold morphism (and the category Man_∞ is not cartesian closed), it is also a representative of the corresponding manifold morphism $f' \in \mathsf{Man}_\infty(N, T^*M)$.

4.5 Smooth semantic connection

The structures described so far form a semantic connection in the sense of Sec. 2 as follows

- the category of smooth manifolds and smooth morphisms provides both the universe of 'spaces' to define systems, and the universe for 'types' to carry tests, i.e.
$$\mathcal{S} \;=\; \mathcal{T} \;=\; \mathsf{Man}_\infty$$
- the 'model/predicate' adjuntion $M^{op} \dashv P : \mathcal{S}^{op} \to \mathcal{T}$ is given by the cotangent bundle construction
$$(T^*)^{op} \dashv T^* : \mathsf{Man}^{op} \to \mathsf{Man}$$
- the 'tests functor' Θ is the cotangent bundle functor $T_\# : \mathsf{Man} \to \mathsf{Man}$,
- the 'process functor' Σ is the tangent bundle functor $T_* : \mathsf{Man} \to \mathsf{Man}$,
- the distributivity law $\lambda : \Theta P \to P\Sigma$ is derived as follows
$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathbb{R}^{T^*} \times T_* \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}\times\models} \mathbb{R}^{T^*} \times \mathbb{R}^{T^*} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{R}}{\lambda' : T_* \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^{T^*}} \twoheadrightarrow T^*T_\#T^*}}{\lambda : T_\#T^* \to T^*T_*} \tag{39}$$
where $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ is the distance on the manifold, and $\models$ is the testing correlation between the tangents and the cotangents, induced as

follows



(40)

5 Examples and applications

5.1 Newtonian physics using coalgebras

We work in Man_∞ with smooth maps. A *dynamical system* modeled on M is a coalgebra $X : M \to T_*M$.

Definition 5.1. *The model category* Dyn *of* dynamical systems *has as objects dynamical systems, that is smooth sections $X : M \to T_*M$ of the tangent bundle, and as morphisms $\langle f : M \to N, T_*f\rangle$ such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{f} & N \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle X} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Y} \\ T_*M & \xrightarrow{T_*f} & T_*N \end{array}$$

commutes. The dynamical systems X and Y are called f-related. The identity and composition are induced from Man_∞.

Dyn is the category of T_*-coalgebras Man_{T_*}. The path category $\Sigma_*\mathsf{Man}$ is a full subcategory of Dyn where the objects are in the form $R : I \to T_*I$ for open intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. We have $R(t) = (t, 1)$ that is $\dot{x} = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = 1$ represents a clock[7] at unit rate, setting a unit time interval. $T_*I \cong I \times \mathbb{R}$ is trivializable. We will assume that I contains the point 0.

Definition 5.2. *A trajectory of a dynamical system is a morphism $\gamma : R \to X$ from the 'clock' morphism $R : I \to TI$ to the dynamical system $X : M \to T_*M$ such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & M \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle R} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle X} \\ T_*I & \xrightarrow{T_*\gamma} & T_*M \end{array}$$

[7] *ρολòϊ*, Greek for clock, so the clock vector field is denoted R..

commutes.

Remark. R describes the eigentime of a test particle (its internal clock) moving on the path. A suitable (monotone) map $R \mapsto R'$ would describe the movement of the test particle with a different clockrate, hence points towards special relativity. We stick to classical mechanics here.

From $X \circ \gamma = T_*\gamma \circ R$ one obtains $(\gamma(t), \mathbf{D}\gamma(t) \cdot 1) = (\gamma(t), X(\gamma(t)) \cdot 1)$ and hence a first order differential equation $\dot{\gamma}(t) = X(\gamma(t))$ for $\gamma(t)$ with initial condition $q = \gamma(0)$. Such a curve is an *integral curve*. It can be integrated for some parameter ranges and initial conditions. The integral curve is unique on a maximal parameter range $I = (-a, a)$ [25].

From coalgebras $x : X \to T_*X$ we get first order ordinary differential equations of the prototypical form $\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t))$. A formal solution is given by direct integration $x(t) = \int f(x(t)) = \Phi(x(t))$. The integral operator is (circumstances permitting) a Fredholm operator and allows an iterative solution (resolvents and Neumann series). More prominently a solution to the ordinary differential equation is a fix point for the integral operator Φ, hence integral curves for a vector field (flow) are *fix points*.

Newtonian gravity. Our running example will be Newton's law of gravity. We use the following notations: m is the mass (constant non relativistic) of a body, r its position with base point 0 in a Euclidean space $E = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $\hat{r}_{12} = r_{12}/|r_{12}|$ is the unit vector in direction of r_{12}, $v = \dot{r} = \mathrm{d}r/\mathrm{d}t$ is the velocity of a body, $p = \mathrm{d}(m\,v)/\mathrm{d}t = m\dot{v}$ the (linear) momentum, and $a = \dot{v}$ the acceleration. We put a source (mass) m_1 at the origin. The gravitational potential $\phi(r_{12}) = G\frac{m_1}{|r_{12}|}$ (potential energy per unit mass, zero at $|r_{12}| = \infty$) gives rise to the gravitational force[8] $F(r_{12}) = \langle -\nabla m_2\phi(r_{12}), \hat{r}_{12}\rangle\hat{r}_{12} = -m_2\,\mathbf{D}\phi(r_{12})$ on a test body m_2 at position r_{12}. Here we use the relation between gradient and (directional) derivative $(\nabla f(x)) \cdot v = (\mathbf{D}_v)f(x) = \mathbf{D}f(x) \cdot v$. $F \in \Gamma T_*X$ is a section of the tangent bundle and assigns to each r_{12} a linear curve (i_{UX} is the inverse of a trivial chart)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{F} & T_*X \\ {\scriptstyle i_{UX}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \langle i_{UX}\circ\pi_0,\, \mathbf{D}i_{UX}\rangle} \\ U & \xrightarrow{F_U} & U \times \mathbb{R}^3 \end{array} \tag{41}$$

$$F_U = \left\langle r_{12}, -G\frac{m_1 m_2}{|r_{12}|^3} r_{12}\right\rangle = \left\langle r_{12}, -m_2\,\mathbf{D}\phi(r_{12})\right\rangle \tag{42}$$

Newton's second law. With the notation from above, Newtonian physics is based on three postulates:

[8] Technically, by Newton's third law (see below), the source m_1 is moved by the reaction force of the test mass m_2, and one uses the center of mass and the reduced two body problem. If $m_1 \gg m_2$ one can ignore this.

NP1: For zero external force, any body moves on a straight line with constant velocity. That is $F = 0 \Rightarrow \dot{v} = 0$.

NP2: The change of momentum is equivalent to the external force acting on the body. The law of motion is $\dot{p} = F$ with $p = mv$ and constant mass ($\dot{p} = m\dot{v}$).

NP3: For any two bodies m_i, $1 \leq i \leq 2$, their interaction is such that the force F_{12} (1 acts on 2) and F_{21} (2 acts on 1) are summing to zero $F_{12} + F_{21} = 0$. Action equals reaction.

Newton's second law implies

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t} = v \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{1}{m}F(r) \qquad \text{Lagrangian or configuration space view} \tag{43}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{p}{m} \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}p}{\mathrm{d}t} = F(r) \qquad \text{Hamiltonian or phase space view.} \tag{44}$$

The difference is that we look at different bundle structures. One can switch between these views taking into account the 'evaluation' (actually using the Hamiltonian and the symplectic form)

$$T_{\#}M \times T_*M \to \mathbb{R} :: (r,p) \times (r,v) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}p(v) = \frac{1}{2}\langle mv, v\rangle$$

by the Riesz representation theorem. It involves the mass of the test body $m = m_2$ and describes the kinetic energy E_{kin} of the test body.

For (43) consider the tangent bundle $F = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3 = T_*E$. Its points are states of the system $(r,v) \in T^r_*X$, and T_*X is called *configuration space*. The configuration space is a manifold, and the law of motion induces a curve in it, that is we get (using the names for maps in a local chart)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
I & \xrightarrow{\quad r \quad} & E & \xrightarrow{\langle 1, v\circ r^{-1}\rangle} & T_*E \\
{\scriptstyle R=\langle 1,\mathbf{D}\rangle}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle 1, v\circ r^{-1}\rangle} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle\langle \pi_0,\pi_1\rangle, \langle \pi_1, \frac{1}{m}F\circ\pi_0\rangle\rangle} \\
T_*I & \xrightarrow[T_*r]{} & T_*E & \xrightarrow[T\langle 1, v\circ r^{-1}\rangle]{} & T_*T_*E
\end{array}$$

The commutativity of the left square $T_*r \circ R = \langle 1, v \circ r^{-1}\rangle \circ r$ gives $(r(t), \frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t}(t)) = (T_*r \circ R)(t) = (\langle 1, v\circ r^{-1}\rangle \circ r)(t) = (r(t), v(t))$, that is the lhs of (43). The commutativity of the right square boils down to the commutativity of the lower triangle as the dashed arrow is identity. Hence one gets $((r,v),(v,\frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t})) = (T_*\langle 1, v\circ r^{-1}\rangle)(r,v) = \big\langle\langle \pi_0,\pi_1\rangle, \langle \pi_1, \frac{1}{m}F\circ\pi_0\rangle\big\rangle(r,v) = ((r,v),(v,\frac{1}{m}F(r)))$ and hence the rhs of (43). A solution to this differential equation for the flow of the gravitational field is an integral curve in the double tangent bundle $F(r,v) = ((r,v),(v,\frac{1}{m}F(r)))$. The canonical flip acts trivially on this vector field.

For (44) consider the cotangent bundle $T_{\#}E = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Its points are states of the system $(r, p) \in T^r_{\#}E$, and $T^r_{\#}E$ is called *phase space*. The phase space is a manifold, and the law of motion induces a curve in it, that is we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\langle 1, \frac{p}{m} \circ r^{-1} \rangle} & T_{\#}E \\ {\scriptstyle \langle 1, \frac{p}{m} \circ r^{-1} \rangle}\downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle \langle \pi_0, \pi_1 \rangle, \langle \pi_1, F \circ \pi_0 \rangle \rangle} \\ T_{\#}E & \xrightarrow[T_*(\langle 1, \frac{p}{m} \circ r^{-1} \rangle)]{} & T_*T_{\#}E \end{array}$$

The corresponding vector field on phase space is given in [1, p.240] and reads $F(r, p) = ((r, p), (p/m, F(r))) \in T_*T_{\#}E$. Note that unlike for the double tangent bundle T^2_*X we cannot expect the canonical flip to act here trivially as a duality T_*X versus $T_{\#}X$ is involved.

5.2 Other applications

So far, this work focused on the correlations of tangents and cotangents over the *same* manifold. But the examples that arise in most applications involve two different manifolds: one to present the vector field, the other one to present the form on which it acts. Interesting questions that open up in this direction include:

Testing and monoidal (multilinear) structures. The example of Newtonian gravity in Section 5 describes one test particle in an external gravitational field of a source (mass). A natural question is to ask what happens when one looks at many particle systems. In such a situation one needs to study paths $\gamma_i(t)$ parameterized over an index set I. That is one looks at products of coalgebra maps each describing a path for a single particle in the presence of the others. Alternatively one can study the path of a single system in a higher dimensional space. E.g. two particles moving in $\mathbb{R}^3$ can be described as single system moving in $\mathbb{R}^6$. Categorically this asks how the (co)tangent functors interact with sums and products $T_*(E + F)$ versus $T_*E \otimes T_*F$. Moreover, looking at the monad evaluation $T_*T_*M \xrightarrow{\delta} T_*M$ is given by the sum $\mu = + \circ u_M = + \circ \langle p_T, T_*p \rangle$ of the two projections from the double tangent bundle to the pullback bundle. The canonical flip, describing the commutativity of partial derivatives, and hence providing a local integrability condition, ensures that this can be done. What really is needed is a monoidal structure on the (co)tangent bundles which interacts properly with the lifting result of the Representation Theorem 2.1. This would allow to study the categorical backbone of k-forms for $k \geq 1$. This is important, as for example electromagnetism, and in general gauge theories, are based on (curvature) 2-forms, e.g. the Maxwell tensor F is a closed 2-form.

Symplectic structure, general relativity. The testing framework yields in the differential geometry setting very naturally the tangent T_*, $T_{\#}$ and cotangent T^* functors. On (finite) linear fiber spaces there is a closed structure

available. However, in physical applications one uses also noncanonical identifications of these spaces.

A *symplectic form* is an isomorphism $\omega : T_*M \leftrightarrow T^*M : \Omega$. Using the closed structure one has $\omega \in T^*M \wedge T^*M$. This 2-form plays a fundamental role in dynamical systems, e.g. transformations leaving this form invariant are *symplectomorphisms* inducing *canonical transformations* and do not change the nature of a physical system. The symplectic form provides also a description of time evolution of systems via the Hamiltonian H. Let $H : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable map, and consider the 1-form $\mathrm{d}H$, which acts via the closed structure on $Y \in T_*M$. Then one can define a Hamiltonian vector field $X_H \in T_*M$ via $\mathrm{d}H(Y) = \omega(X_H, Y)$. The Hamiltonian vector field describes the evolution of the system and implies the Hamiltonian form of the equations of motion. The interaction of the symplectic form, that is the closed structure, and the testing framework providing fixed point operators should allow to study general aspects of dynamical systems in a new way.

Given a (locally Minkowski) metric g on the manifold allows to put a metric on the linear models $g : T_*M \times T_*M \to \mathbb{R}$. Via the Riesz representation theorem this identifies also T_*M and T^*M. We have seen that dynamical systems arise from the lifting of the paths functor Σ to T_*-coalgebras. Hence to make the metric a dynamical object, one needs a similar lifting for the situation in the diagram of the last paragraph with the metric identification of T^* with T_* and wise versa. Such a dynamic involves curvature as we are now dealing with higher forms, and it should be possible to employ the testing framework in a general relativistic setup. Note also that the distributivity law (39) depends on the distance function $d : \mathbb{R}^{T^*} \times \mathbb{R}^{T^*} \to \mathbb{R}$ allowing to include a metric.

Quantum mechanics. The testing framework does not choose bases, and also does not need in principle finite dimensional (co)tangent spaces. It is hence general enough to model infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces. Testing on such spaces can no longer be done point wise (Heisenberg uncertainty) and needs test functions. Using compactly supported or Schwartz test functions destroys the closed structure on the vector bundles as duals of such function spaces are strictly larger. Moreover, certain operators like the momentum operator are no longer bounded (continuous). Restricting the tests in the test category still allows to test systems, at the cost to be able to detect only such behavior which is distinguishable by the chosen tests. One may expect that a coalgebraic study of this situation can reveal new insights not easy to gain by rather concrete coordinate based methods.

Scalings in chaotic systems and quantum field theory. Another way to employ coalgebraic methods in dynamical systems comes from studying fixed points and iterative solutions of processes. Following iteratively a tangent vector field one obtains an approximation of integral curves (numerical integration). Suppose $f : E \to E$ is such a map. Let $f = f^1$ have a fixed point $f(a) = a$, and define $f^n = f \circ f^{n-1}$ the n-fold iteration of f. One defines formally the

iteration velocity $v(x) = \partial f^n(x)/\partial n|_{n=0}$. Let $g : E \to E$ be another function. In many applications one is interested in the composition $g(f(x))$. Of course, $g(f(a)) = g(a)$ for the fixed point. In nonlinear dynamical systems and in quantum field theory at such fixed points the system enjoys a *scale invariance*. However, apart from it the system changes behavior for different scales. Using the iteration velocity as a (tangent) vector field, one obtains a solution for the composition problem

$$g(f(x)) = \exp\left(v(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) g(x)$$

The flow of this vector field is a renormalization flow of the system. In quantum field theory $v(x)$ is the beta-function and determines the 'running' (varying) coupling strength at a different energy scales. It seems plausible that techniques well established in computer science, e.g. final coalgebras etc, when employed via testing, could help studying these situations on a categorical level.

6 Summary and future work

Since its inception, category theory has played a crucial role in algebraic topology and algebraic geometry. There have many categorical approaches to vector calculus and to differential geometry, synthetic [24] and classical [15]. There is a lot of current work, some of which we mentioned in the introduction. To the wealth of ideas and techniques resulting from all that work, we add a relatively minor conceptual wrinkle: semantical connections of vector fields and differential forms, and testing one over the other. On one hand, it is just a matter of presentation: we just proposed a coalgebraic reconstruction of standard concepts. This points towards a new realm of research in coalgebra, but it is not obvious that this research leads towards some genuinely new results in vector calculus or differential geometry. On the other hand, a high level overview, abstracting away the irrelevant implementation details of a complicated mathematical theory can sometimes be even more useful than a particular mathematical result. This is not often the case, but it gave us a reason to pursue the ideas of smooth coalgebra, and of testing in vector analysis.

We started from the view of vector fields as coalgebras $M \to T_*M$ splitting the tangent bundle projection $T_*M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$. This is just the coalgebraic form of the familiar cross section requirement, which assures that the corresponding vector fields are locally determined. Coalgebras not satisfying this requirement permit nonlocal interactions. Differential forms similarly arise as the crossections $M \to T_\#M$ of the cotangent bundle projection $T_\#M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M$. The Main Theorem opened up the alley towards testing vector fields and differential forms. But the actual explorations of that alley are left for the future work.

So what did we actually do here? We defined the sheaves ΣM and ΘM, consisting respectively of the paths and of the tests over a manifold M, and established the canonical testing correlation between them $\Sigma M \times \Theta M \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{R}$, mapping a path $\varsigma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ and a test $t : M \to \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbf{D}(t \circ \varsigma)(0)$. Applying the

testing factorization (5) to $\mathbb{T}$, we then derived the tangent bundle T_*M, as the sheaf of paths indistinguishable under the tests, and the cotangent bundle functor T^*M, as the sheaf of tests indistinguishable under the paths. As a byproduct of the construction, the testing correlation $T_*M \times T^*M \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{R}$ emerged in (40), embedding $T_*M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{T^*M}$ and $T^*M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{T_*M}$. Uncovering a duality of T_*M and T^*M is in itself, of course, hardly surprising. Uncovering it through a testing correlation, akin to the ?Gedankenexperiments? whereby Turing machines give birth to complexity classes, is perhaps more interesting. Where does it lead?

In Sec. 4.5, we outlined a possible second application of the testing factorization (5), towards a coalgebraic framework for describing the families of smooth behaviors indistinguishable under a family of smooth tests. This leads towards a coalgebraic extension of Mackey's *dual systems* [34], studied in detail in [16, Ch. 2-3], and axiomatized in *Chu categories* [4, 6]. While the testing correlations considered in this paper were limited to the tangents and the cotangents on the same manifold M, the correlations considered in the practice are often between the tangents on one manifold, and the cotangents on another one. An interesting framework to further research in this direction seems to be the category STC, where

- the objects are the *smooth testing correlations*

$$\alpha \quad = \quad \left(\alpha_* \times \alpha_\# \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{R}\right)$$

  where
  - $T_*M \xrightarrow{\alpha_*} M$ is an algebra,
  - $N \xrightarrow{\alpha_\#} T_\#N$ is a coalgebra, and
  - the testing correlations $\mathbb{T}$ make the following square commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_*M \times N & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \times \alpha_\#} & T_*M \times T_\#N \\ {\scriptstyle \alpha_* \times \mathrm{id}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbb{T}} \\ M \times N & \xrightarrow[\mathbb{T}]{} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

- a morphism $f : \alpha \to \beta$ is a pair $f = \langle f_*, f_\# \rangle$ where
  - $\alpha_* \xrightarrow{f_*} \beta_*$ is an algebra homomorphism,
  - $\beta_\# \xrightarrow{f_\#} \alpha_\#$ is a coalgebra homomorphism, and
  - following square commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times N' & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \times f_\#} & M \times N \\ {\scriptstyle f_* \times \mathrm{id}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbb{T}_\alpha} \\ M' \times N' & \xrightarrow[\mathbb{T}_\beta]{} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

where M' is the underlying object of β_* and N' is the underlying object of $\beta_\#$.

The morphisms between certain integral operators as testing correlations express the Stokes-type of theorems (including the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus). The behaviors observable through such testing correlations can now be extracted by factoring out the separable and extensional objects of the category STC [5, Sec. 2]. The various algebraic invariants arise from manifolds through testing vector fields, just like the classes of languages arise through testing state machines. The question is whether this conceptual link is strong enough to support any technical hooks.

Acknowledgements and apology. We are grateful to the editors and to the anonymous reviewers for their patience and help. Some of the high level ideas pursued in this work were suggested to in a phone conversation with Bill Lawvere, following the second author's talk about Chu spaces some 20 years ago, about the work reported in [45]. It took us more than 10 years to overcome the sheer excitement about receiving the call, and to understand what was suggested. The framework presented here subsequently evolved through a variety of concrete domain specific applications (modeling hybrid systems, control, embedded systems), and it took another 10 years for an occasion to arise for a general overview. At best, the present paper brings us in the position to begin to study the original idea, sketched in the final section. Although an elaboration set in cartesian closed categories, along the lines of [29], would probably be conceptually cleaner, we thought that it might be useful that a story which is potentially of interest for several different communities (coalgebraists, physicists, functional analysts ...) be told in a language as standard and as simple as possible. But the balance of a presentation is always a matter of skill and taste, and we can only hope that our clumsiness will not completely obscure the clarity of the ideas that we attempted to present.

References

[1] R. Abraham, J.E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu. *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 75. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[2] P. Aczel. *Non-well-founded Sets*. Number 14 in Lecture Notes. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, 1988.

[3] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, and J.L. Verdier. *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étalé des schémas*, volume 269, 270, 305 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1972.

[4] Michael Barr. $*$-*Autonomous Categories*, volume 752 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[5] Michael Barr. $*$-autonomous categories, revisited. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 111(1):1–20, 1996.

[6] Michael Barr. The chu construction: history of an idea. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 17(1):10–16, 2006.

[7] Marco Bernardo, Rocco De Nicola, and Michele Loreti. Revisiting trace and testing equivalences for nondeterministic and probabilistic processes. In Lars Birkedal, editor, *Proceedings of FOSSACS 2012*, volume 7213 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 195–209. Springer, 2012.

[8] Richard Blute, J. Robin B. Cockett, and R. A. G. Seely. Differential categories. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(6):1049–1083, 2006.

[9] Richard Blute, J. Robin B. Cockett, and R. A. G. Seely. Cartesian differential categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 22(23):622–672, 2009.

[10] S. Caenepeel, G. Militaru, and Shenglin Zhu. *Frobenius and separable functors for generalized module categories and nonlinear equations*. Springer Verlag, 2002.

[11] J.R.B. Cockett and G.S.H. Cruttwell. Differential structure, tangent structure, and SDG. *submitted to Applied Categorical Structures*, pages 1–73, May 2012.

[12] J.R.B. Cockett and R.A.G. Seely. The Faà di Bruno construction. *Theor. and Appl. of Categories*, 25:394–425, 2011.

[13] Rocco De Nicola and Matthew Hennessy. Testing equivalences for processes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 34:83–133, 1984.

[14] A. Dold. *Lectures on Algebraic Topology*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1995.

[15] A. Frölicher and A. Kriegl. *Linear spaces and differentiation theory*. Pure and applied mathematics. Wiley, 1988.

[16] A. Grothendieck. *Topological Vector Spaces*. Notes on mathematics and its applications. Gordon and Breach, 1973.

[17] Esfandiar Haghverdi, Paulo Tabuada, and George J. Pappas. Bisimulation relations for dynamical, control, and hybrid systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 342(2-3):229–261, 2005.

[18] David Harel, Jerzy Tiuryn, and Dexter Kozen. *Dynamic Logic*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2000.

[19] Ichiro Hasuo, Bart Jacobs, and Ana Sokolova. Generic trace semantics via coinduction. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(4), 2007.

[20] Allyn Jackson. Comme Appelé du Néant - As If Summoned from the Void: The Life of Alexandre Grothendieck. *Notices of the AMS*, 51(4,10):1038–1056, 1196–1212, November 2004.

[21] Benoît Michel Jubin. *The tangent functor monad and foliations*. PhD thesis, University of Berkeley, Berkeley, 2012. arxiv:1401.0940.

[22] Bartek Klin. Bialgebraic operational semantics and modal logic. In *LICS*, pages 336–345. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.

[23] Bartek Klin. Bialgebraic methods and modal logic in structural operational semantics. *Inf. Comput.*, 207(2):237–257, 2009.

[24] A. Kock. *Synthetic Differential Geometry*, volume 333 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[25] I. Kolar, P.W. Michor, and J. Slovak. *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.

[26] Clemens Kupke, Alexander Kurz, and Dirk Pattinson. Algebraic semantics for coalgebraic logics. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 106:219–241, 2004.

[27] Clemens Kupke, Alexander Kurz, and Dirk Pattinson. Ultrafilter extensions for coalgebras. In José Luiz Fiadeiro et al, editor, *CALCO*, volume 3629 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 263–277. Springer, 2005.

[28] Alexander Kurz and Jirí Rosický. Strongly complete logics for coalgebras. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(3), 2012.

[29] F. William Lawvere. Toward the description in a smooth topos of the dynamically possible motions and deformations of a continuous body. *Cahiers de Topologie et Gomtrie Diffrentielle Catgoriques*, 21(4):377–392, 1980.

[30] William F. Lawvere. Continuously variable sets: algebraic geometry = geometric logic. In *Logic Colloquium '73 (Bristol, 1973)*, volume 80 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 135–156. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.

[31] William F. Lawvere. Categories of spaces may not be generalized spaces as exemplified by directed graphs. *Revista Colombiana de Matematicas*, 20:179–186, 1986.

[32] J. Leray. Sur la forme des espaces topologiques et sur les pointes fixes des représentations. *J. Math. Pures et Appl.*, 9:95–249, 1945.

[33] S. Mac Lane and I. Moerdijk. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992.

[34] George Mackey. On infinite dimensional vector spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 51(57):155–207, 1945.

[35] B. Mesablishvili and R. Wisbauer. Galois functors and entwining structures. *J. Algebra*, 324:464–506, 2010.

[36] B. Mesablishvili and R. Wisbauer. Bimonads and Hopf monads on categories. *J. of K-Theory*, 7(2):349–388, 2011.

[37] Robin Milner. *Communication and concurrency*. International Series in Computer Science. Prentice Hall, London, 1989.

[38] M. Modungo and G. Stefani. Some results on second tangent and cotangent spaces. *Quaderni dell'Instituto di Matematica dell' Universitá di Lecce.*, Q.16:1–23, 1978.

[39] I. Moerdijk. Monads on tensor categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 168(2-3):189–208, 2002.

[40] E.F. Moore. Gedanken experiments on sequential machines. In C. E. Shannon and J. McCarthy, editors, *Automata Studies*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, pages 129–153, Princeton, 1956. Princeton University Press.

[41] Rob J. van Glabbeek. The linear time-branching time spectrum (extended abstract). In Jos C. M. Baeten and Jan Willem Klop, editors, *Proceedings of CONCUR '90*, volume 458 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 278–297. Springer, 1990.

[42] Rob J. van Glabbeek. The linear time - branching time spectrum II. In Eike Best, editor, *Proceedings of CONCUR '93*, volume 715 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1993.

[43] D. Pavlovic, M. Mislove, and J.B. Worrell. Testing semantics: Connecting processes and process logic. In M. Johnson and V. Vene, editors, *AMAST 2006*, LNCS 4019, pages 308–322. Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2006. (The version with the Appendix is available from `dusko.org`).

[44] Dusko Pavlovic. Convenient categories of processes and simulations I: modulo strong bisimilarity. In D. Pitt et al., editor, *Category Theory and Computer Science '95*, volume 953 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–24. Springer Verlag, 1995.

[45] Dusko Pavlovic. Chu i: cofree equivalences, dualities and $*$-autonomous categories. *Math. Structures in Comp. Sci.*, 7(2):49–73, 1997.

[46] Dusko Pavlovic. Monoidal computer I: Basic computability by string diagrams. *Information and Computation*, 226:94–116, 2013. arxiv:1208.5205.

[47] Dusko Pavlović and Martín Escardó. Calculus in coinductive form. In V. Pratt, editor, *Proceedings. Thirteenth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 408–417. IEEE Computer Society, 1998.

[48] Dusko Pavlovic, Peter Pepper, and Douglas R. Smith. Evolving specification engineering. In Jose Meseguer and Grigore Rosu, editors, *Proceedings of AMAST 2008*, volume 5140 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 299–314. Springer Verlag, 2008.

[49] Dusko Pavlovic, Peter Pepper, and Douglas R. Smith. Formal derivation of concurrent garbage collectors. In Jules Desharnais, editor, *Proceedings of MPC 2010*, volume 6120 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 353–376. Springer Verlag, 2010. full version arxiv.org:1006.4342.

[50] Dusko Pavlovic and Douglas R. Smith. Composition and refinement of behavioral specifications. In *Automated Software Engineering 2001. The Sixteenth International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. IEEE, 2001.

[51] Dusko Pavlovic and Douglas R. Smith. Guarded transitions in evolving specifications. In H. Kirchner and C. Ringeissen, editors, *Proceedings of AMAST 2002*, volume 2422 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 411–425. Springer Verlag, 2002.

[52] Duško Pavlović. Towards semantics of self-adaptive software. In Paul Robertson et al, editor, *Proceedings of the Workshop on Self-Adaptive Software*, volume 1936 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–64. Springer Verlag, 2001.

[53] Vaughan R Pratt. Semantical consideration on Floyd-Hoare logic. In *17th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 109–121. IEEE, 1976.

[54] J Rosický. Abstract tangent functors. *Diagrammes*, 12(3):JR1–JR11, 1984.

[55] J. Rutten. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 249:3–80, 2000.

[56] L. Schwartz. *Théorie des distributions*. Hermann, Paris, 1950.

[57] B.R. Tennison. *Sheaf Theory*. Cambridge Monographs on Physics. Cambridge University Press, 1975.

[58] Daniele Turi and Gordon D. Plotkin. Towards a mathematical operational semantics. In *LICS*, pages 280–291. IEEE Computer Society, 1997.

A Norms and vector spaces

Manifolds and their relations to differential geometry and sheaves are well studied. In preparing the paper, we used the books by MacLane and Moerdijk [33], and by Abraham, Marsden and Ratiu [1]. The statements given without proof are proved in these books. For further information about invariant operations in differential geometry see [25]. *Smoothness* allows to approximate functions

and such approximations are characterized using norms (or if available inner products).

Definition A.1. *A* norm *of a real vector space E is a mapping from E into the reals $\|\cdot\| : E \to \mathbb{R} :: e \mapsto \|e\|$ such that:*

- *N1* $\|e\| \geq 0$ *for all* $e \in E$*, and* $\|e\| = 0$ *if and only if* $e = 0$ *(positive definiteness).*
- *N2* $\|\lambda e\| = |\lambda| \, \|e\|$*, for all* $e \in E$ *and* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ *(multiplicativity).*
- *N3* $\|e_1 + e_2\| \leq \|e_1\| + \|e_2\|$ *for all* $e_1, e_2 \in E$ *(triangle inequality).*

$(E, \|\cdot\|)$ *is a normed space. A norm complete space is called a* Banach space.

A more special situation arises in presence of an inner product.

Definition A.2. *A real* inner product space *is a real vector space E together with a mapping $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : E \times E \to \mathbb{R} :: (e_1, e_2) \mapsto \langle e_1, e_2\rangle$ such that:*

- *I1* $\langle e, e_1 + e_2\rangle = \langle e, e_1\rangle + \langle e, e_2\rangle$*, (linearity, part 1).*
- *I2* $\langle e_1, \lambda e_2\rangle = \lambda\langle e_1, e_2\rangle$*, (linearity, part 2).*
- *I3* $\langle e_1, e_2\rangle = \langle e_2, e_1\rangle$*, (symmetry).*
- *I4* $\langle e, e\rangle \geq 0$ *and* $\langle e, e\rangle = 0$ *if and only if* $e = 0$ *(positive definiteness).*

Positive definiteness provides a non natural isomorphism $E \to \mathbb{R}^E \cong E^*$ with the dual vector space E^*. If such an isomorphism exists the space is called reflexive. *A complete (w.r.t. a metric) reflexive inner product space is called* Hilbert space.

The complex case does not pose any difficulty here, and one defines Hermitian inner products using the complex involution analogously. An inner product space is a normed space by setting $\|e\|^2 = \langle e, e\rangle$.

Definition A.3. *A* metric *or* distance *map on a set E is a map $d_E : E \times E \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

- *d1* $d(x, y) \geq 0$ *non-negativity or separation axiom.*
- *d2* $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$*, coincidence axiom (if not fulfilled d_E is called pseudo metric).*
- *d3* $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ *symmetry (if not fulfilled d_E is called quasi metric).*
- *d4* $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ *triangle inequality.*

d1 and d2 state positive definiteness. An *intrinsic metric* d_M on a manifold M can be approximated by the length of paths connecting two points $x = \gamma(0)$, $y = \gamma(1)$ and $d_M(x,y) = \inf_\gamma \text{length}(\gamma)$. Suppose E has an addition $+ : E \times E \to E$, e.g. a vector space structure, then d is *translation invariant* if for all $x, y, a \in E$ holds $d(x,y) = d(x+a, y+a)$. Any norm implies a metric by $d(x,y) := \|y - x\|$. A metric is *homogeneous* if for $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $x, y \in E$ holds $d(rx, r, y) = |r| d(x,y)$. A translation invariant homogeneous metric defines a norm $\|x\| := d(x, 0)$.

Theorem A.4 (Riesz representation theorem)**.** *Let E be an real inner product space. The map $e \mapsto \langle \cdot, e \rangle$ is a linear norm preserving isomorphism of E with E^*.*

In other words, every linear form in E^* can be realized as an inner product with some fixed vector $e \in E$. We denote by $L(E,F)$ the linear morphisms from E to F.

B Differential

If $f : U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is differentiable, then choosing coordinates (bases), gives f explicit as an m-tuple of functions in n coordinates ($y_1 = f^1(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, $\ldots, y_m = f^m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$). The differential $\mathbf{D}f(x)$ at a point $x_0 \in U$ is then given by the Jacobian matrix $J(f) \simeq \mathbf{D}f$

$$\mathbf{D}f(x_0) := \left[\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{\partial f^1(x)}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f^1(x)}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f^m(x)}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f^m(x)}{\partial x_n} \end{array} \right]_{x=x_0}$$

For $m = 1$ one has $y = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and the differential becomes

$$\mathbf{D}f = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right], \quad \text{applied to } e = (e^1, \ldots, e^n)^t \qquad \mathbf{D}f(x) \cdot e = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} e^i.$$

As an example for an iterated differential $\mathbf{D}^2 f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}) \cong L(\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$, with $f : U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ one obtains

$$\mathbf{D}^2 f(x_0) = \left[\frac{\partial^2 f(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right]_{x=x_0}.$$

From this it is easy to conclude that the differential is a linear operator on the space of sufficiently often differentiable functions.

The tangent construction T_* is algebraically and geometrically simpler that $\mathbf{D}$. Think of (u, e) as a vector e in E with base point u, then $T_* f(u, e) = (f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e)$ is the image vector in F with base point $f(u)$. The map T_* is functorial while $\mathbf{D}$ suffers from a morphism present to change the base point successively. To see this let $f : U \subset E \to F$ and $g : V \subset F \to G$ be composable C^1 maps, then we get the

Theorem B.1. *(Composite mapping theorem) With f, g as above, $g \circ f : U \subset E \to G$ is also C^1. Moreover*

$$\begin{aligned} T_*(g \circ f) &= T_*(g) \circ T_*(f) \\ \mathbf{D}(g \circ f)(u) &= \mathbf{D}g(f(u)) \cdot \mathbf{D}f(u) \qquad \textit{(chain rule).} \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The equation for $\mathbf{D}$ is the *chain rule* and reads in coordinates as follows:

$$\frac{\partial (g \circ f)^j(x)}{\partial x^i} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial g^j(f(x))}{\partial y^k} \frac{\partial f^k(x)}{\partial x^i} \qquad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad y^k = f^k(x). \tag{46}$$

The chain rule implies the Leibniz rule if applied to $B \in L(F_1 \otimes F_2, G)$ and map $f_1 \times f_2 : U \times U \to F_1 \times F_2$.

Theorem B.2. *(Leibniz rule) Let $f_i : U \subset E \to F_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ be of class C^1, and $B \in L(F_1 \otimes F_2, G)$. Then the mapping $B(f_1, f_2) = B \circ (f_1 \times f_2) : U \subset E \to G$ is of class C^1 and*

$$\mathbf{D}(B(f_1, f_2))(u) \cdot e = B(\mathbf{D}f_1(u) \cdot e, f_2(u)) + B(f_1(u), \mathbf{D}f_2(u) \cdot e)$$

For one dimensional real vector spaces B is just multiplication in $\mathbb{R}$, hence $\mathbf{D}(f_1 f_2)(u) = \mathbf{D}(f_1(u)) f_2(u) + f_1(u)\, \mathbf{D}f_2(u)$, where $e = 1$ is the unit vector tangent to the real line.

The tangent map can be applied to itself, hence one can define the second tangent map $T_*^2 f = T_*(T_* f)$. Let $f : U \subset E \to F$, then the second tangent map is given locally in terms of differentials as

$$\begin{aligned} &T_*^2 f : (U \times E) \times (E \times E) \to (F \times F) \times (F \times F) \\ &\quad (u, e_1, e_2, e_3) \mapsto (f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_1, \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_2, \mathbf{D}^2 f(u) \cdot (e_1, e_2) + \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_3) \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

To see this, recall that

$$T_* f(u, e) = (f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e).$$

Applying T_* to $T_* f$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} T_*(T_* f)(u, e_1, e_2, e_3) &= (T_* f(u, e_1), \mathbf{D}(T_* f)(u, e_1) \cdot (e_2, e_3)\,) \\ &= (f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_1, \mathbf{D}\left[(f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_1)\right] \cdot (e_2, e_3)\,) \\ &= (f(u), \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_1, \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_2, \mathbf{D}^2 f(u) \cdot (e_1, e_2) + \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e_3\,) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality the identity $\mathbf{D}[1] = \pi_1$ has been used and the Leibniz rule was applied.

To finish the setup, we consider differentials in a particular direction. A *differentiable path* is a class C^1 map from an open interval $\gamma : I \subset \mathbb{R} \to E$ into E, with differential $\mathbf{D}\,\gamma(t) \in L(I, E)$. $L(\mathbb{R}, E)$ is identified with E via $\mathbf{D}\,\gamma(t)$ acting on $e = 1$. The differential of the curve is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\mathrm{dt}}(t) = \mathbf{D}\,\gamma(t) \cdot 1\,.$$

Composing a C^1 curve $\gamma : I \to E$ with a C^1 map $f : E \to F$ and using the chain rule yields

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{dt}}(f(\gamma(t))) = \mathbf{D}(f \circ \gamma)(t) \cdot 1 = \mathbf{D}f(\gamma(t)) \cdot \frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\mathrm{dt}}(t)$$

Using the linear approximation $\gamma_L(t) = u + t \cdot e$ of $\gamma(t)$ one arrives at the

Theorem B.3. *Let $f : U \subset E \to F$ be of C^1 differentiable at u, then the* directional differential *exists at u and reads*

$$\frac{d}{dt}(f(u + t \cdot e))|_{t=0} = \mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e = \mathbf{D}_e f(u).$$

If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with coordinate (basis) functions x^i and let $e = x^1 e_1 + \ldots + x^n e_n$ (usually normalized) expressed in the standard basis $\{e_i\}$, then the directional differential (in one or many directions v_i) reads

$$\mathbf{D}f(u) \cdot e = \mathbf{D}_e f(u) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^1} x^1 + \ldots + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^n} x^n$$
$$\mathbf{D}^k_{v_1,\ldots,v_k} f(u) = \frac{\partial^k}{\partial t_1 \cdots \partial t_k} f(u + t_1 v_1 + \ldots + t_k v_k)|_{t_i=0}$$

As we compare linearizations, we can replace the open interval I by $\mathbb{R}$ if the reparameterization is done in such a way that base points and tangents are preserved.